

On the Longest Increasing Subsequence for Finite and Countable Alphabets

Christian Houdré ^{*} Trevis J. Litherland [†]

February 2, 2008

Abstract

Let $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n, \dots$ be a sequence of iid random variables with values in a finite alphabet $\{1, \dots, m\}$. Let LI_n be the length of the longest increasing subsequence of $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$. We express the limiting distribution of LI_n as functionals of m and $(m-1)$ -dimensional Brownian motions. These expressions are then related to similar functionals appearing in queueing theory, allowing us to further establish asymptotic behaviors as m grows. The finite alphabet results are then used to treat the countable (infinite) alphabet.

AMS 2000 Subject Classification: 60C05, 60F05, 60F17, 60G15, 60G17, 05A16

Keywords: Longest increasing subsequence, Brownian functional, Functional Central Limit Theorem, Tracy-Widom distribution.

1 Introduction

The pursuit of a robust understanding of the asymptotics of the length of the longest increasing subsequence $L\sigma_n$ of a random permutation of length n – often known as "Ulam's Problem" – has given rise to a remarkable collection

^{*}Georgia Institute of Technology, School of Mathematics, Atlanta, Georgia, 30332-0160
E-mail address: houdre@math.gatech.edu

[†]Georgia Institute of Technology, School of Mathematics, Atlanta, Georgia, 30332-0160
E-mail address: trevisl@math.gatech.edu

of results in recent years. The work of Logan and Shepp [20], and Vershik and Kerov [29], first showed that $\mathbb{E}L\sigma_n/\sqrt{n} \rightarrow 2$. Following this fundamental asymptotic result, Baik, Deift, and Johansson, in their landmark paper [3], determined the limiting distribution of $L\sigma_n$, properly centered and normalized. This problem has emerged as a nexus of once seemingly unconnected mathematical ideas. Indeed, the latter paper is, in particular, quite remarkable for the sheer breadth of mathematical machinery required, machinery calling upon an understanding of random matrix theory, the asymptotics of Toeplitz operators, Riemann-Hilbert Theory, as well as the Robinson-Schensted-Knuth correspondence, to obtain the limiting Tracy-Widom distribution.

Initial approaches to the problem relied heavily on combinatorial arguments. Most work of the last decade, however, such as that of Aldous and Diaconis [1] and Seppäläinen [25], have instead used interacting particle processes and so-called "hydrodynamical arguments" to show that $L\sigma_n/\sqrt{n} \rightarrow 2$ in expectation and in probability. Building on these ideas, Groeneboom [11] proves such convergence results using only the convergence of random signed measures, while Cator and Groeneboom [5] prove that $\mathbb{E}L\sigma_n/\sqrt{n} \rightarrow 2$ in a way that avoids both ergodic decomposition arguments and the subadditive ergodic theorem. Aldous and Diaconis [2] also connect these particle process concepts to the card game patience sorting. Finally, Seppäläinen [26] employs these particle processes to verify an open asymptotics problem in queueing theory. Moving beyond the asymptotics of $\mathbb{E}L\sigma_n$, Cator and Groeneboom [6] use particle processes to directly obtain the cube-root asymptotics of the variance of $L\sigma_n$. Further non-asymptotic results for $L\sigma_n$ are found in [10].

The related problem of the asymptotics of LI_n when the sequence is drawn uniformly from a finite alphabet of size m has developed along parallel lines. Tracy and Widom [27], as well as Johansson [18], have shown that the limiting distribution again enjoys a direct connection to the distribution of the largest eigenvalue in the Gaussian Unitary Ensemble paradigm. Its, Tracy, and Widom [16, 17] have further examined this problem in the inhomogeneous case, relating the limiting distribution to certain direct sums of GUEs. In another direction, Chistyakov and Götze [7] have pursued the two-letter Markov case.

Problems from statistical physics have long inspired a lot of the research into these topics. Kuperberg [19], for instance, shows that certain quantum spin matrices are, in law, asymptotically equal to a traceless GUE matrix. The standard general overview of the subject of random matrices is Mehta

[21], a work motivated and influenced by some of the origins of the subject in physics.

While the above achievements have undoubtedly stimulated further inquiry, one might still suspect that a more direct route to the limiting distribution of LI_n might be had, one whose methods reflect the essentially probabilistic nature of the problem. This paper proposes a step towards such an approach for the independent finite alphabet case, calling only upon some very well-known results of classical probability theory described below. Indeed, the sequel will show that the limiting distribution of LI_n can be constructed in a most natural manner as a Brownian functional. In the context of random growth processes, Gravner, Tracy, and Widom [9] have already obtained a Brownian functional of the form we derive. This functional appeared first in the work of Glynn and Whitt [8], in queueing theory, and its relation to the eigenvalues of the GUE has independently been studied by Baryshnikov [4]. It is, moreover, remarked in [9] that the longest increasing subsequence problem could also be studied using a Brownian functional formulation.

We begin our study of this problem, in the next section, by expressing LI_n as a simple algebraic expression. Using this simple characterization, we then briefly determine, in Section 3, the limiting distribution of LI_n (properly centered and normalized) in the case of an m -letter alphabet with each letter drawn independently. Our result is expressed as a functional of an $(m - 1)$ -dimensional Brownian motion with correlated coordinates. Using certain natural symmetries, this limiting distribution is further expressed as various functionals of a (standard) Brownian motion. In Section 4, connections with the Brownian functional originating with the work of Glynn and Whitt in queueing theory are investigated. This allows us to investigate the asymptotics as m grows. Section 5 is devoted to obtaining the corresponding results for countable alphabets. In Section 6, we finish the paper by indicating some open questions and future directions for research.

2 Combinatorics

Let $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n, \dots$ consist of a sequence of values taken from an m -letter ordered alphabet, $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \dots < \alpha_m$. Let a_k^r be the number of occurrences of $\alpha_r \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ among $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_k$, $1 \leq k \leq n$. Each increasing subsequence of $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$ consists simply of runs of identical values,

with the values of each successive run forming an increasing subsequence of α_r . Moreover, the number of occurrences of $\alpha_r \in \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m\}$ among $X_{k+1}, \dots, X_\ell$, where $1 \leq k < \ell \leq n$, is simply $a_\ell^r - a_k^r$. The length of the longest increasing subsequence of $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$ is then given by

$$LI_n = \max_{\substack{0 \leq k_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq k_{m-1} \leq n}} [(a_{k_1}^1 - a_0^1) + (a_{k_2}^2 - a_{k_1}^2) + \dots + (a_n^m - a_{k_{m-1}}^m)], \quad (2.1)$$

i.e.,

$$LI_n = \max_{\substack{0 \leq k_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq k_{m-1} \leq n}} [(a_{k_1}^1 - a_{k_1}^2) + (a_{k_2}^2 - a_{k_2}^3) + \dots + (a_{k_{m-1}}^{m-1} - a_{k_{m-1}}^m) + a_n^m], \quad (2.2)$$

where $a_0^r = 0$. For $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $r = 1, \dots, m-1$, let

$$Z_i^r = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } X_i = \alpha_r, \\ -1, & \text{if } X_i = \alpha_{r+1}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

and let $S_k^r = \sum_{i=1}^k Z_i^r$, $k = 1, \dots, n$, with also $S_0^r = 0$. Then clearly $S_k^r = a_k^r - a_k^{r+1}$. Hence,

$$LI_n = \max_{\substack{0 \leq k_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq k_{m-1} \leq n}} \{S_{k_1}^1 + S_{k_2}^2 + \dots + S_{k_{m-1}}^{m-1} + a_n^m\}. \quad (2.4)$$

Since $a_k^1, \dots, a_k^m$ must evidently sum to k , we have

$$\begin{aligned} n &= \sum_{r=1}^m a_n^r \\ &= - \sum_{r=1}^{m-1} r(a_n^{r+1} - a_n^r) + ma_n^m \\ &= - \sum_{r=1}^{m-1} rS_n^r + ma_n^m. \end{aligned}$$

Solving for a_n^m gives us

$$a_n^m = \frac{n}{m} - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{r=1}^{m-1} r S_n^r.$$

Substituting into (2.4), we finally obtain

$$LI_n = \frac{n}{m} - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{r=1}^{m-1} r S_n^r + \max_{\substack{0 \leq k_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq k_{m-1} \leq n}} \{S_{k_1}^1 + S_{k_2}^2 + \dots + S_{k_{m-1}}^{m-1}\}. \quad (2.5)$$

The expression (2.5) is of a *purely combinatorial nature or, in more probabilistic terms, is of a pathwise nature*. We now analyze (2.5) in light of the probabilistic nature of the sequence $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$.

3 Probabilistic Development

Throughout the sequel, Brownian functionals will play a central rôle. By a *Brownian motion* we shall mean an a.s. continuous, centered Gaussian process $B(t)$, $0 \leq t \leq 1$, with $B(0) = 0$, having stationary, independent increments. By a *standard Brownian motion* we shall mean that $\text{Var} B(t) = t$, $0 \leq t \leq 1$, i.e., we endow $C[0, 1]$ with the Wiener measure. A *standard m -dimensional Brownian motion* will be defined to be a vector-valued process consisting of m independent Brownian motions. More generally, an *m -dimensional Brownian motion* shall refer to a linear transformation of a standard m -dimensional Brownian motion. Throughout the paper, we assume that our underlying probability space is rich enough so that all the Brownian motions and sequences we study can be defined on it.

We consider first the case in which $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n, \dots$ are iid, with each letter drawn uniformly from $\mathcal{A} = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m\}$. Then for each fixed letter r , the sequence $Z_1^r, Z_2^r, \dots, Z_n^r, \dots$ is also formed of iid random variables with $\mathbb{P}(Z_1^r = 1) = \mathbb{P}(Z_1^r = -1) = 1/m$, and $\mathbb{P}(Z_1^r = 0) = 1 - 2/m$.

Thus $\mathbb{E} Z_1^r = 0$, and $\mathbb{E}(Z_1^r)^2 = 2/m$, and so, $\text{Var} S_n^r = 2n/m$, for $r = 1, 2, \dots, m-1$. Defining $\hat{B}_n^r(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2n/m}} S_{[nt]}^r + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2n/m}} (nt - [nt]) Z_{[nt]+1}^r$, for $0 \leq t \leq 1$, and noting that the local maxima of $\hat{B}_n^i(t)$ occur at $t = k/n$, $k = 0, \dots, n$, we have from (2.5) that

$$\frac{LI_n - n/m}{\sqrt{2n/m}} = -\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} i \hat{B}_n^i(1) + \max_{\substack{0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{m-1} \leq 1}} [\hat{B}_n^1(t_1) + \dots + \hat{B}_n^{m-1}(t_{m-1})]. \quad (3.1)$$

We note that we can now invoke Donsker's Theorem since the measures $\mathbb{P}_n$ generated by $(\hat{B}_n^1(t), \dots, \hat{B}_n^{m-1}(t))$ satisfy $\mathbb{P}_n(A) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_\infty(A)$, for all Borel subsets A of the space of continuous functions $C([0, 1]^{m-1})$ for which $\mathbb{P}_\infty(\partial A) = 0$, where $\mathbb{P}_\infty$ is the limiting $(m-1)$ -dimensional Wiener measure. Then, applying Donsker's Theorem and the Continuous Mapping Theorem we have that $(\hat{B}_n^1(t), \dots, \hat{B}_n^{m-1}(t)) \Rightarrow (\tilde{B}^1(t), \dots, \tilde{B}^{m-1}(t))$, where the Brownian motion on the right has a covariance structure which we now describe. First, $\text{Cov}(Z_1^r, Z_1^s) = \mathbb{E}Z_1^r Z_1^s = 0$, for $|r - s| \geq 2$, and $\text{Cov}(Z_1^r, Z_1^{r+1}) = \mathbb{E}Z_1^r Z_1^{r+1} = -1/m$, for $r = 1, 2, \dots, m-1$. Then, as already noted, for each fixed r , $Z_1^r, Z_2^r, \dots, Z_n^r, \dots$ are iid, and for fixed k , $Z_k^1, Z_k^2, \dots, Z_k^{m-1}$ are dependent but identically distributed random variables. Moreover, it is equally clear that for any r and s , $1 \leq r < s \leq m-1$, the sequences $(Z_k^r)_{k \geq 1}$ and $(Z_\ell^s)_{\ell \geq 1}$ are also identical distributions of the Z_k^r and that Z_k^r and Z_ℓ^s are independent for $k \neq \ell$. Thus, $\text{Cov}(S_n^r, S_n^s) = n \text{Cov}(Z_1^r, Z_1^s)$. This result, together with our $2n/m$ normalization factor gives the following covariance matrix for $(\tilde{B}^1(t), \dots, \tilde{B}^{m-1}(t))$:

$$t \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1/2 & & & \circ \\ -1/2 & 1 & -1/2 & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \\ \circ & & -1/2 & 1 & -1/2 \\ & & & -1/2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.2)$$

We remark here that the functional in (3.1) is a bounded linear functional on $C(0, 1)^{m-1}$. (This fact will be used throughout the paper.) Hence, by a final application of the Continuous Mapping Theorem,

$$\frac{LI_n - n/m}{\sqrt{2n/m}} \Rightarrow -\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} i \tilde{B}^i(1) + \max_{\substack{0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{m-1} \leq 1}} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \tilde{B}^i(t_i). \quad (3.3)$$

We have thus obtained the limiting distribution of LI_n as a Brownian functional. Tracy and Widom [27] already obtained the limiting distribution of LI_n in terms of the distribution of the largest eigenvalue of the Gaussian Unitary Ensemble (GUE) of $m \times m$ Hermitian matrices having trace

zero. Johansson [18] generalized this work to encompass all m eigenvalues. Gravner, Tracy, and Widom [9] in their study of random growth processes make a connection between the distribution of the largest eigenvalue in the $m \times m$ GUE and a Brownian functional essentially equivalent, up to a normal random variable, to the right hand side of (3.3). (This will become clear as we refine our understanding of (3.3) in the sequel.) For completeness, we now state our result.

Proposition 3.1 *Let $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n, \dots$ be a sequence of iid random variables drawn uniformly from the ordered finite alphabet $\mathcal{A} = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m\}$. Then*

$$\frac{LI_n - n/m}{\sqrt{2n/m}} \Rightarrow -\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} i\tilde{B}^i(1) + \max_{\substack{0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{m-1} \leq 1}} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \tilde{B}^i(t_i), \quad (3.4)$$

where $(\tilde{B}^1(t), \dots, \tilde{B}^{m-1}(t))$ is an $(m-1)$ -dimensional Brownian motion with covariance matrix given by (3.2).

For $m = 2$, (3.4) simply becomes

$$\frac{LI_n - n/2}{\sqrt{n}} \Rightarrow -\frac{1}{2}B(1) + \max_{0 \leq t \leq 1} B(t), \quad (3.5)$$

where B is standard one-dimensional Brownian motion. A well-known result of Pitman [24] implies that, up to a factor of 2, the functional in (3.5) is identical in law to the radial part of a three-dimensional standard Brownian motion at time $t = 1$. Specifically, Pitman shows that the process $2 \max_{0 \leq s \leq t} B(s) - B(t)$ is identical in law to $\sqrt{(B^1(t))^2 + (B^2(t))^2 + (B^3(t))^2}$, where $(B^1(t), B^2(t), B^3(t))$ is a standard 3-dimensional Brownian motion.

Let us now show that the functional in (3.5) does indeed have the same distribution as that of the largest eigenvalue of a 2×2 zero-trace matrix of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} X & Y + iZ \\ Y - iZ & -X \end{pmatrix},$$

where X , Y , and Z are centered independent normal random variables, all with variance $1/4$. These random variables have a joint density given by

$$f_3(x, y, z) = \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^{3/2} e^{-2x^2-2y^2-2z^2}, \quad (x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3.$$

It is straightforward to show that the largest eigenvalue of our matrix is given by $\lambda_1 = \sqrt{X^2 + Y^2 + Z^2}$. Thus, up to a scaling factor of 2, λ_1 is equal in law to the radial Brownian motion expression of Pitman at $t = 1$. Explicitly, since $4\lambda_1^2 = 4X^2 + 4Y^2 + 4Z^2$ consists of the sum of the squares of three iid standard normal random variables, $4\lambda_1^2$ must have a χ^2 distribution with 3 degrees of freedom. Since this distribution has a density of $h(x) = (1/\sqrt{2\pi})x^{1/2}e^{-x/2}$, we immediately find that λ_1 has density

$$\begin{aligned} g(\lambda_1) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} (4\lambda_1^2)^{1/2} e^{-(4\lambda_1^2)/2} (8\lambda_1) \\ &= \frac{16}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \lambda_1^2 e^{-2\lambda_1^2}, \quad \lambda_1 > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Let us look now at the connection between the 2×2 GUE and the traceless matrix we have just analyzed. Consider the 2×2 matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} X_1 & Y + iZ \\ Y - iZ & X_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

where X_1 , X_2 , Y , and Z are independent normal random variables, with $\text{Var}X_1 = \text{Var}X_2 = 1/2$, and with $\text{Var}Y = \text{Var}Z = 1/4$. Since these random variables have a joint density given by

$$f_4(x_1, x_2, y, z) = \frac{2}{\pi^2} e^{-x_1^2 - x_2^2 - 2y^2 - 2z^2}, \quad (x_1, x_2, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^4,$$

conditioning on the zero-trace subspace $\{X_1 + X_2 = 0\}$, and using the transformation $X'_1 = (X_1 - X_2)/\sqrt{2}$ and $X'_2 = (X_1 + X_2)/\sqrt{2}$, we obtain the conditional density

$$f_3(x'_1, y, z) = \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^{3/2} e^{-2(x'_1)^2 - 2y^2 - 2z^2}$$

which is also the joint density of three iid centered normal random variables X'_1 , Y , and Z with common variance $1/4$, which we had previously obtained.

Let us finally note that one can directly evaluate (3.5) in a classical manner using the Reflection Principle to obtain the corresponding density (see, *e.g.* [9, 13]).

It is instructive to express (3.4) in terms of an $(m-1)$ -dimensional standard Brownian motion $(B^1(t), \dots, B^{m-1}(t))$. It is not hard to check that we can express $\tilde{B}^i(t)$, $i = 1, \dots, m-1$, in terms of the $B^i(t)$ as follows:

$$\tilde{B}^i(t) = \begin{cases} B^1(t), & i = 1, \\ \sqrt{\frac{i+1}{2i}} B^i(t) - \sqrt{\frac{i-1}{2i}} B^{i-1}(t), & 2 \leq i \leq m-1. \end{cases} \quad (3.6)$$

Substituting (3.6) back into (3.4), we obtain a more symmetric expression for our limiting distribution:

$$\frac{LI_n - n/m}{\sqrt{n}} \Rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \max_{\substack{0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{m-1} \leq t_m = 1}} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \left[-\sqrt{\frac{i}{i+1}} B^i(t_{i+1}) + \sqrt{\frac{i+1}{i}} B^i(t_i) \right]. \quad (3.7)$$

The above Brownian functional is similar to one introduced by Glynn and Whitt [8], in the context of a queueing problem:

$$D_m = \max_{\substack{0=t_0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{m-1} \leq t_m = 1}} \sum_{i=1}^m [B^i(t_i) - B^i(t_{i-1})], \quad (3.8)$$

where $(B^1(t), \dots, B^m(t))$ is an m -dimensional standard Brownian motion. Gravner, Tracy, and Widom [9], in studying a one-dimensional discrete space and discrete time process, have shown that its limiting distribution is equal in law to both D_m and also to the largest eigenvalue $\lambda_1^{(m)}$ of an $m \times m$ Hermitian matrix taken from a GUE. That is, D_m and $\lambda_1^{(m)}$ are in fact identical in law. Independently, Baryshnikov [4], studying closely related problems of queueing theory and of monotonous paths on the integer lattice, has shown that the *process* $(D_m)_{m \geq 1}$ has the same law as the *process* $(\lambda_1^{(m)})_{m \geq 1}$, where $\lambda_1^{(m)}$ is the largest eigenvalue of the matrix consisting of the first m rows and m columns of an infinite matrix in the Gaussian Unitary Ensemble.

Remark 3.1 *It is quite clear that $LI_n \geq n/m$ a.s., since at least one of the m letters must lie on a substring of length at least n/m . Hence, the limiting functional in (3.4) must be supported on the positive real line. Can we see*

directly that a.s. the functional on the right hand side of (3.7) is also non-negative? Indeed, for consider the more general Brownian functional of the form

$$\max_{\substack{0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{m-1} \leq t_m = 1}} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} [\beta_i B^i(t_{i+1}) - \eta_i B^i(t_i)],$$

where $0 \leq \beta_i \leq \eta_i$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, m-1$. Now for any fixed $t_{i+1} \in (0, 1]$, $i = 1, \dots, m-1$, $\max_{0 \leq t_i \leq t_{i+1}} [\beta_i B^i(t_{i+1}) - \eta_i B^i(t_i)]$ is at least as large as the maximum value at the two extremes, that is, when $t_i = 0$ or $t_i = t_{i+1}$. These two values are simply $\beta_i B^i(t_{i+1})$ and $(\beta_i - \eta_i) B^i(t_{i+1})$. Since $0 \leq \beta_i \leq \eta_i$ a.s., at least one of these two values is non-negative. Hence, we can successively find $t_{m-1}, t_{m-2}, \dots, t_1$ such that each term of the functional is non-negative a.s. Thus the whole functional must be non-negative a.s. Taking $\beta_i = \sqrt{i/(i+1)}$ and $\eta_i = \sqrt{(i+1)/i}$, the result holds for (3.7). The functional of Glynn and Whitt in (3.8) does not succumb to the same analysis since the $i = 1$ term demands that $t_0 = 0$.

Let us now turn our attention to the m -letter case wherein each letter $\alpha_r \in$ occurs with probability $0 < p_r < 1$, independently, and the p_r need not be equal as in the previous uniform case. For the non-uniform case, Its, Tracy, and Widom in [16] and [17] obtained the limiting distribution of LI_n . Reordering the probabilities such that $p_1 \geq p_2 \geq \dots \geq p_m$, and grouping those probabilities having identical values $p_{(j)}$ of multiplicity k_j , $j = 1, \dots, d$, (so that $\sum_{j=1}^d k_j = m$ and $\sum_{j=1}^d p_{(j)} k_j = 1$), they show that the limiting distribution is identical in law to the distribution of the largest eigenvalue of the direct sum of d mutually independent $k_j \times k_j$ GUEs, whose eigenvalues $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_m) = (\lambda_1^{k_1}, \lambda_2^{k_1}, \dots, \lambda_{k_1}^{k_1}, \dots, \lambda_1^{k_d}, \lambda_2^{k_d}, \dots, \lambda_{k_d}^{k_d})$ satisfy $\sum_{i=1}^m \sqrt{p_i} \lambda_i = 0$. With the above ordering of the probabilities, the limiting distribution simplifies to a k_1 -fold integral involving only p_1 and k_1 . (See Remark 4.4 for some explicit expressions and more details.) We now state our own result in terms of functionals of Brownian motion.

Theorem 3.1 *Let $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n, \dots$ be a sequence of iid random variables such that $\mathbb{P}(X_1 = \alpha_r) = p_r$, for $r = 1, \dots, m$, where $0 < p_r < 1$ and $\sum_{r=1}^m p_r = 1$. Then*

$$\frac{LI_n - p_{\max}n}{\sqrt{n}} \Rightarrow -\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} i\sigma_i \tilde{B}^i(1) + \max_{\substack{0=t_0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{m-1} \leq t_m=1 \\ t_i=t_{i-1}, i \in I^*}} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \sigma_i \tilde{B}^i(t_i), \quad (3.9)$$

where $p_{\max} = \max_{1 \leq r \leq m} p_r$, $\sigma_r^2 = p_r + p_{r+1} - (p_r - p_{r+1})^2$, $I^* = \{r \in \{1, \dots, m\} : p_r < p_{\max}\}$, and where $(\tilde{B}^1(t), \dots, \tilde{B}^{m-1}(t))$ is an $(m-1)$ -dimensional Brownian motion with covariance matrix given by

$$t \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \rho_{1,2} & \rho_{1,3} & \cdots & \rho_{1,m-1} \\ \rho_{2,1} & 1 & \rho_{2,3} & \cdots & \rho_{2,m-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & & 1 & \rho_{m-2,m-1} \\ \rho_{m-1,1} & \rho_{m-1,2} & \cdots & \rho_{m-1,m-2} & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

with

$$\rho_{r,s} = \begin{cases} -p_r - \frac{\mu_r \mu_s}{\sigma_r \sigma_s}, & s = r-1, \\ -p_s - \frac{\mu_r \mu_s}{\sigma_r \sigma_s}, & s = r+1, \\ -\frac{\mu_r \mu_s}{\sigma_r \sigma_s}, & |r-s| > 1, \quad 1 \leq r, s \leq m-1, \end{cases}$$

and with $\mu_r = p_r - p_{r+1}$, $1 \leq r \leq m-1$.

Proof. As before, we begin with the expression for LI_n displayed in (2.5), noting that for each letter α_r , $1 \leq r \leq m-1$, $(Z_k^r)_{k \geq 1}$ forms a sequence of iid random variables, and that moreover Z_k^r and Z_ℓ^s are independent for $k \neq \ell$, and for any r and s . Now, however, for each fixed k , the Z_k^r are no longer identically distributed; indeed,

$$\begin{cases} \mu_r := \mathbb{E}Z_1^r = p_r - p_{r+1}, & 1 \leq r \leq m-1, \\ \sigma_r^2 := \text{Var}Z_1^r = p_r + p_{r+1} - (p_r - p_{r+1})^2, & 1 \leq r \leq m-1. \end{cases} \quad (3.10)$$

Since $0 < p_r < 1$, we have $\sigma_r^2 > 0$ for all $1 \leq r \leq m-1$. We are thus led to define our approximation to a Brownian motion by

$$\hat{B}_n^r(t) := \frac{S_{[nt]}^r - \mu_r n}{\sigma_r \sqrt{n}} + (nt - [nt]) \frac{Z_{[nt]+1}^r}{\sigma_r \sqrt{n}}, \quad 0 \leq t \leq 1, \quad r = 1, \dots, m-1.$$

Again noting that the local maxima of $\hat{B}_n^i(t)$ occur on the set $\{t : t = k/n, k = 0, \dots, n\}$, (2.5) becomes

$$LI_n = \frac{n}{m} - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} i \left[\sigma_i \hat{B}_n^i(1) \sqrt{n} + \mu_i n \right] + \max_{\substack{0=t_0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{m-1} \leq t_m=1}} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \left[\sigma_i \hat{B}_n^i(t_i) \sqrt{n} + \mu_i t_i n \right] \right\}. \quad (3.11)$$

Next,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} i \mu_i &= \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \sum_{j=i}^{m-1} \mu_j = \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \sum_{j=i}^{m-1} (p_j - p_{j+1}) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} (p_i - p_m) = (1 - p_m) - (m-1)p_m \\ &= 1 - mp_m. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, (3.11) becomes

$$LI_n = \frac{n}{m} - \frac{(1 - mp_m)n}{m} - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} i \sigma_i \hat{B}_n^i(1) \sqrt{n} + \max_{\substack{0=t_0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{m-1} \leq t_m=1}} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \left[\sigma_i \hat{B}_n^i(t_i) \sqrt{n} + \mu_i t_i n \right], \quad (3.12)$$

and, dividing through by $\sqrt{n}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{LI_n}{\sqrt{n}} &= p_m \sqrt{n} - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} i \sigma_i \hat{B}_n^i(1) \\ &\quad + \max_{\substack{0=t_0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{m-1} \leq t_m=1}} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \left[\sigma_i \hat{B}_n^i(t_i) + \mu_i t_i \sqrt{n} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

Let $t_0 = 0$, and let $\Delta_i = t_i - t_{i-1}$, $i = 1, \dots, m-1$. Since

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \mu_i t_i = \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \mu_i \sum_{j=1}^i \Delta_j = \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \Delta_i \sum_{j=i}^{m-1} \mu_j = \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \Delta_i (p_i - p_m),$$

(3.13) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{LI_n}{\sqrt{n}} &= p_m \sqrt{n} - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} i \sigma_i \hat{B}_n^i(1) \\ &\quad + \max_{\substack{\Delta_i \geq 0 \\ \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \Delta_i \leq 1}} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \sigma_i \hat{B}_n^i(t_i) + \sqrt{n} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \Delta_i (p_i - p_m) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

where $t_i = \sum_{j=1}^i \Delta_j$.

Setting also $\Delta_m = 1 - t_{m-1}$ (i.e., $t_m := 1$), (3.14) enjoys a more symmetric representation as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{LI_n}{\sqrt{n}} &= -\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} i \sigma_i \hat{B}_n^i(1) \\ &\quad + \max_{\substack{\Delta_i \geq 0 \\ \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \Delta_i = 1}} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \sigma_i \hat{B}_n^i(t_i) + \sqrt{n} \sum_{i=1}^m \Delta_i p_i \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

Let $p_{\max} = \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} p_i$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{LI_n - p_{\max} n}{\sqrt{n}} &= -\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} i \sigma_i \hat{B}_n^i(1) \\ &\quad + \max_{\substack{\Delta_i \geq 0 \\ \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \Delta_i = 1}} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \sigma_i \hat{B}_n^i(t_i) + \sqrt{n} \sum_{i=1}^m \Delta_i (p_i - p_{\max}) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

Clearly, if $\Delta_i > 0$ for any i such that $p_i < p_{\max}$, then

$$\sqrt{n} \sum_{i=1}^m \Delta_i (p_i - p_{\max}) \xrightarrow{a.s.} -\infty.$$

Intuitively, then, we should demand that $\Delta_i = 0$ for $i \in I^* := \{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\} : p_i < p_{\max}\}$. Indeed, we now show that in fact

$$\frac{LI_n - p_{\max} n}{\sqrt{n}} = -\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} i \sigma_i \hat{B}_n^i(1) + \max_{\substack{0=t_0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{m-1} \leq t_m=1 \\ t_i=t_{i-1}, i \in I^*}} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \sigma_i \hat{B}_n^i(t_i) + E_n, \quad (3.17)$$

where the remainder term E_n is a random variable converging to zero in probability as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

To see this, let us introduce the following notation. Writing $t = (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{m-1})$, let $T = \{t : 0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \leq t_{m-1} \leq 1\}$ and let $T^* = \{t \in T : t_i = t_{i-1}, i \in I^*\}$. Setting $C_n(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \sigma_i \hat{B}_n^i(t_i)$ and $R(t) = \sum_{i=1}^m (t_i - t_{i-1})(p_{max} - p_i)$, we can, respectively, rewrite the maximal terms of (3.16) and (3.17) as

$$\max_{t \in T} [C_n(t) - \sqrt{n}R(t)]$$

and

$$\max_{t \in T^*} C_n(t).$$

By the compactness of T and T^* and the continuity of $C_n(t)$ and $R(t)$, we see that for each n and each $\omega \in \Omega$, there is a $\tau_n \in T$ and a $\tau_n^* \in T^*$ such that

$$C_n(\tau_n) - \sqrt{n}R(\tau_n) = \max_{t \in T} [C_n(t) - \sqrt{n}R(t)],$$

and

$$C_n(\tau_n^*) = \max_{t \in T^*} C_n(t).$$

(Note that the piecewise-linear nature of $C_n(t)$ and the linear nature of $R(t)$ imply that the arguments maximizing the above must lie on a finite set and that the measurability of τ_n and τ_n^* is trivial.)

Now we first claim that the set of optimizing arguments $\{\tau_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ a.s. does not have an accumulation point lying outside of T^* . Suppose the contrary, namely that for each ω in a set A of positive measure, there is a subsequence $(\tau_{n_k})_{k=1}^\infty$ of $(\tau_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ such that $d(\tau_{n_k}, T^*) > \epsilon$, for some $\epsilon > 0$, where the metric d is the one induced by the L_∞ -norm over T , i.e., by $\|t\|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq i \leq m-1} |t_i|$.

Then, since $T^* \subset T$, it follows that, for all n ,

$$C_n(\tau_n) - \sqrt{n}R(\tau_n) \geq C_n(\tau_n^*),$$

almost surely. Now if $p_{max} = p_m$, then $t = (0, \dots, 0) \in T^*$, and if for some $1 \leq j \leq m-1$ we have $p_{max} = p_j > \max_{j+1 \leq i \leq m} p_i$, then $t = (0, \dots, 0, 1, \dots, 1) \in T^*$, where there are j zeros in t . Hence $C_{n_k}(\tau_{n_k}^*) \geq C_{n_k}(0, \dots, 0, 1, \dots, 1) = \sum_{i=j+1}^{m-1} \sigma_i \hat{B}_{n_k}^i(1)$ a.s., where the sum is taken to be zero for $j = m$. Given $0 < \delta < 1$, by the Central Limit Theorem, we can find a sufficiently negative real α such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(C_{n_k}(\tau_{n_k}) - \sqrt{n_k}R(\tau_{n_k}) \geq \alpha) &\geq \mathbb{P}(C_{n_k}(\tau_{n_k}^*) \geq \alpha) \\
&\geq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=j+1}^{m-1} \sigma_i \hat{B}_{n_k}^i(1) \geq \alpha\right) \\
&> 1 - \delta,
\end{aligned}$$

for n_k large enough. In particular, this implies that

$$\mathbb{P}(A \cap \{C_{n_k}(\tau_{n_k}) - \sqrt{n_k}R(\tau_{n_k}) \geq \alpha\}) > \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{P}(A), \quad (3.18)$$

for n_k large enough.

Next, note that for any $t \in T$, we can modify its components t_i to obtain an element of T^* , by collapsing certain consecutive t_i s to single values, where $i \in \{j-1, j, \dots, \ell\}$ and $\{j, j+1, \dots, \ell\} \subset I^*$. With this observation, it is not hard to see that by replacing such maximal consecutive sets of components $\{t_i\}_{i=j-1}^\ell$ with their median values, we must have

$$d(\tau_{n_k}, T^*) = \max_{\{(j, \ell): \{j, j+1, \dots, \ell\} \subset I^*\}} \frac{(\tau_{n_k}^\ell - \tau_{n_k}^{j-1})}{2}.$$

Writing $p_{(2)}$ for the largest of the $p_i < p_{max}$, we see that for all k , and for almost all $\omega \in A$,

$$\begin{aligned}
R(\tau_{n_k}) &= \sum_{i=1}^m (\tau_{n_k}^i - \tau_{n_k}^{i-1})(p_{max} - p_i) \\
&= \sum_{i \in I^*} (\tau_{n_k}^i - \tau_{n_k}^{i-1})(p_{max} - p_i) \\
&\geq (p_{max} - p_{(2)}) \sum_{i \in I^*} (\tau_{n_k}^i - \tau_{n_k}^{i-1}) \\
&\geq 2(p_{max} - p_{(2)})d(\tau_{n_k}, T^*) \geq 2(p_{max} - p_{(2)})\epsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Now by Donsker's Theorem and the Continuous Mapping Theorem, we have that

$$\max_{t \in T^*} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \sigma_i \hat{B}_{n_k}^i(t_i) \Rightarrow \max_{t \in T^*} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \sigma_i \tilde{B}_{n_k}^i(t_i),$$

as $n_k \rightarrow \infty$, where $(\tilde{B}^1(t), \dots, \tilde{B}^{m-1}(t))$ is an $(m-1)$ -dimensional Brownian motion described in greater detail below. The point here is simply that this limiting functional exists. Hence, given $0 < \delta < 1$, if M is chosen large enough, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(C_{n_k}(\tau_{n_k}) \leq M) &\geq \mathbb{P}(C_{n_k}(\tau_{n_k}^*) \leq M) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{t \in T^*} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \sigma_i \hat{B}_{n_k}^i(t_i) \leq M\right) \\ &> 1 - \delta, \end{aligned}$$

for n_k large enough.

We now can see how the boundedness of $R(\tau_{n_k})$ on A influences that of the whole expression $C_{n_k}(\tau_{n_k}) - \sqrt{n_k}R(\tau_{n_k})$ by the following estimates. Given $M > 0$ as above, if k is large enough, then

$$n_k \geq \sqrt{(M - \alpha + 1)/(2(p_{max} - p_{(2)})\epsilon)},$$

and also

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(A \cap \{C_{n_k}(\tau_{n_k}) - \sqrt{n_k}R(\tau_{n_k}) \leq \alpha - 1\}) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(A \cap \{C_{n_k}(\tau_{n_k}) \leq \alpha - 1 + \sqrt{n_k}R(\tau_{n_k})\}) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}(A \cap \{C_{n_k}(\tau_{n_k}) \leq \alpha - 1 + \sqrt{n_k}(2(p_{max} - p_{(2)})\epsilon)\}) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}(A \cap \{C_{n_k}(\tau_{n_k}) \leq M\}) \\ &> \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{P}(A). \end{aligned}$$

But this contradicts (3.18), and our optimal parameter sequences $(\tau_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ must a.s. have their accumulation points in T^* .

Thus, given $\epsilon > 0$, there is an integer N_ϵ such that the set $A_{n,\epsilon} = \{d(\tau_k, T^*) < \epsilon^3, k \geq n\}$ satisfies $\mathbb{P}(A_{n,\epsilon}) \geq 1 - \epsilon$, for all $n \geq N_\epsilon$. Now for each τ_n define $\hat{\tau}_n \in T^*$ to be the (not necessarily unique) point of T^* which is closest in the L^∞ -distance to τ_n . Recalling that

$$E_n = C_n(\tau_n) - \sqrt{n}R(\tau_n) - C_n(\tau_n^*) \geq 0,$$

almost surely, and noting that $R(t) \geq 0$, for all $t \in T$, we can estimate the remainder term E_n as follows: for $n \geq N_\epsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(E_n \geq \epsilon) &= \mathbb{P}(\{E_n \geq \epsilon\} \cap A_{n,\epsilon}) + \mathbb{P}(\{E_n \geq \epsilon\} \cap A_{n,\epsilon}^c) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}(\{E_n \geq \epsilon\} \cap A_{n,\epsilon}) + \mathbb{P}(A_{n,\epsilon}^c) \\
&< \mathbb{P}(\{E_n \geq \epsilon\} \cap A_{n,\epsilon}) + \epsilon \\
&= \mathbb{P}(\{C_n(\tau_n) - \sqrt{n}R(\tau_n) - C_n(\tau_n^*) \geq \epsilon\} \cap A_{n,\epsilon}) + \epsilon \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}(\{C_n(\tau_n) - \sqrt{n}R(\tau_n) - C_n(\hat{\tau}_n) \geq \epsilon\} \cap A_{n,\epsilon}) + \epsilon \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}(\{C_n(\tau_n) - C_n(\hat{\tau}_n) \geq \epsilon\} \cap A_{n,\epsilon}) + \epsilon \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \sigma_i(\hat{B}_n^i(\tau_n^i) - \hat{B}_n^i(\hat{\tau}_n^i))\right| \geq \epsilon\right) + \epsilon. \tag{3.19}
\end{aligned}$$

To further bound (3.19), note that for all $n \geq 1$ and all $1 \leq i \leq m-1$, we have $\text{Var}(\hat{B}_n^i(t_i) - \hat{B}_n^i(s_i)) = |t_i - s_i|$. Then, let $(s, t) \in T \times T$ be such that $\|t - s\|_\infty \leq \epsilon^3$. Using the Bienaymé-Chebyshev inequality, we find that for n large enough,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \sigma_i(\hat{B}_n^i(t_i) - \hat{B}_n^i(s_i))\right| \geq \epsilon\right) &\leq \epsilon^{-2}(m-1)^2 \max_{1 \leq i \leq m-1} \sigma_i^2 \|t - s\|_\infty \\
&\leq \epsilon^{-2}(m-1)^2 \max_{1 \leq i \leq m-1} \sigma_i^2 \epsilon^3 \\
&= \epsilon(m-1)^2 \max_{1 \leq i \leq m-1} \sigma_i^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\|\tau_n - \hat{\tau}_n\| < \epsilon^3$, for $n \geq N_\epsilon$, this can be used to bound (3.19):

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(|E_n| \geq \epsilon) &< \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \sigma_i(\hat{B}_n^i(\tau_n^i) - \hat{B}_n^i(\hat{\tau}_n^i))\right| \geq \epsilon\right) + \epsilon \\
&\leq \epsilon \left\{ (m-1)^2 \max_{1 \leq i \leq m-1} \sigma_i^2 + 1 \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, ϵ being arbitrary, we have indeed shown that $E_n \rightarrow 0$ in probability.

Applying Donsker's Theorem, the Continuous Mapping Theorem, and

the converging together lemma to (3.17) we finally have:

$$\frac{LI_n - p_{\max}n}{\sqrt{n}} \Rightarrow -\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} i\sigma_i \tilde{B}^i(1) + \max_{\substack{0=t_0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{m-1} \leq t_m=1 \\ t_i=t_{i-1}, i \in I^*}} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \sigma_i \tilde{B}^i(t_i), \quad (3.20)$$

where $(\tilde{B}^1(t), \dots, \tilde{B}^{m-1}(t))$ is an $(m-1)$ -dimensional Brownian motion with the following covariance matrix:

$$t \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \rho_{1,2} & \rho_{1,3} & \cdots & \rho_{1,m-1} \\ \rho_{2,1} & 1 & \rho_{2,3} & \cdots & \rho_{2,m-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & & 1 & \rho_{m-2,m-1} \\ \rho_{m-1,1} & \cdots & \cdots & \rho_{m-1,m-2} & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$\rho_{r,s} = \begin{cases} -p_r - \frac{\mu_r \mu_s}{\sigma_r \sigma_s}, & s = r-1, \\ -p_s - \frac{\mu_r \mu_s}{\sigma_r \sigma_s}, & s = r+1, \\ -\frac{\mu_r \mu_s}{\sigma_r \sigma_s}, & |r-s| > 1, \quad 1 \leq r, s \leq m-1. \end{cases}$$

Now for $t = \ell/n$, and $1 \leq r \leq s \leq m-1$, the covariance structure above is computed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(\hat{B}_n^r(t), \hat{B}_n^s(t)) &= \text{Cov}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \frac{Z_i^r - \mu_r}{\sigma_r \sqrt{n}}, \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \frac{Z_i^s - \mu_s}{\sigma_s \sqrt{n}}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{n\sigma_r \sigma_s} \text{Cov}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} (Z_i^r - \mu_r), \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} (Z_i^s - \mu_s)\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{n\sigma_r \sigma_s} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \text{Cov}(Z_i^r - \mu_r, Z_i^s - \mu_s) \\ &= \frac{\ell}{n\sigma_r \sigma_s} \text{Cov}(Z_1^r - \mu_r, Z_1^s - \mu_s) \\ &= t \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sigma_r \sigma_s} \sigma_r \sigma_s, & s = r, \\ \frac{1}{\sigma_r \sigma_s} (0 - \mu_r \mu_s - \mu_r \mu_s + \mu_r \mu_s), & s > r+1, \\ \frac{1}{\sigma_r \sigma_s} (-p_s - \mu_r \mu_s - \mu_r \mu_s + \mu_r \mu_s), & s = r+1, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

$$= t \begin{cases} 1 & s = r, \\ -\frac{\mu_r \mu_s}{\sigma_r \sigma_s} & s > r + 1, \\ -\frac{(p_s + \mu_r \mu_s)}{\sigma_r \sigma_s} & s = r + 1, \end{cases}$$

using the properties of the Z_k^r noted at the beginning of the proof. $\blacksquare$

We now study (3.9) on a case-by-case basis. First, let $I^* = \emptyset$, that is, let $p_i = 1/m$, for $i = 1, \dots, m$. Then $\sigma_i^2 = 2p_i = 2/m$, for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$. Hence, simply rescaling (3.9) by $\sqrt{2/m}$ recovers the uniform result in (3.4).

Next, consider the case where $p_{\max} = p_j$, for *precisely one* $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. We then have $I^* = \{1, 2, \dots, m\} \setminus \{j\}$. This forces us to set $0 = t_0 = t_1 = \dots = t_{j-1}$ and $t_j = t_{j+1} = \dots = t_{m-1} = t_m = 1$, in the maximizing term in (3.9). This leads to the following result.

Corollary 3.1 *If $p_{\max} = p_j$ for precisely one $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, then*

$$\frac{LI_n - p_{\max}n}{\sqrt{n}} \Rightarrow -\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} i \sigma_i \tilde{B}^i(1) + \sum_{i=j}^{m-1} \sigma_i \tilde{B}^i(1), \quad (3.21)$$

where the last term in (3.21) is not present if $j = m$.

Remark 3.2 (i) Above, $(LI_n - p_{\max}n)/\sqrt{n}$ converges to a centered normal random variable. Intuitively, this result is not surprising since the longest increasing subsequence is, asymptotically, a string consisting primarily of the most frequently occurring letter, a string whose length is approximated by a binomial random variable with parameters n and $p_{\max}$. We show below that the variance of the limiting normal distribution is, in fact, equal to $p_{\max}(1 - p_{\max})$.

(ii) One could compute the variance of the right hand side of (3.21) directly to verify that it is in fact $p_{\max}(1 - p_{\max})$. However, the nature of the covariance structure of the Brownian motion makes the calculation somewhat cumbersome. Instead, we revisit the approximation to our Brownian motion in the first term on the right hand side of (3.21). In doing this, we not only recover the variance of the limiting distribution, but also see that our approximating functional does indeed take the form of the sum of a binomial random variable and of a term which converges to zero in probability.

Proof. We have from the very definition of the approximation to Brownian motion that

$$\begin{aligned}
-\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} i \sigma_i \hat{B}_n^i(1) &= -\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} i \sigma_i \left[\frac{S_n^i - \mu_i n}{\sigma_i \sqrt{n}} \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left[-\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} i S_n^i + \frac{n}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} i \mu_i \right]. \quad (3.22)
\end{aligned}$$

Recalling that $-\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} i S_n^i = a_n^m - \frac{n}{m}$, and that $\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} i \mu_i = 1 - mp_m$, (3.22) becomes

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left[\left(a_n^m - \frac{n}{m} \right) + \frac{n}{m} (1 - mp_m) \right] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} (a_n^m - np_m). \quad (3.23)$$

Turning to the second term on the right hand side of (3.21) and noting that for $1 \leq j < k \leq m-1$, $\sum_{i=j}^k \mu_i = p_j - p_{k+1}$ and that $\sum_{i=j}^k S_r^i = a_r^j - a_r^{k+1}$, for $1 \leq r \leq n$, we then have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=j}^{m-1} \sigma_i \hat{B}_n^i(1) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left[\sum_{i=j}^{m-1} S_n^i - n \sum_{i=j}^{m-1} \mu_i \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} [(a_n^j - a_n^m) - n(p_j - p_m)] \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} [(a_n^j - np_j) - (a_n^m - np_m)]. \quad (3.24)
\end{aligned}$$

We saw in (3.17) that we could write $(LI_n - p_{max}n)/\sqrt{n}$, as the sum of a functional approximating the Brownian motion and of an error term E_n converging, to zero, in probability. In the present case, this expression simplifies to

$$-\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} i \sigma_i \hat{B}_n^i(1) + \sum_{i=j}^{m-1} \sigma_i \hat{B}_n^i(1) + E_n = \frac{a_n^j - np_j}{\sqrt{n}} + E_n, \quad (3.25)$$

using (3.22)–(3.24).

Now a_n^j is a binomial random variable with parameters n and $p = p_j = p_{max}$. By the Central Limit Theorem and the converging together lemma, the right hand side of (3.25) converges to a $N(0, p_{max}(1 - p_{max}))$ distribution,

while by Donsker's Theorem, the left hand side converges to the Brownian functional obtained in (3.21). Hence, $(LI_n - p_{\max}n)/\sqrt{n} \Rightarrow N(0, p_{\max}(1 - p_{\max}))$, as claimed. $\blacksquare$

Let us now study what happens when $p_{\max} = p_j = p_k$, $1 \leq j < k \leq m$, and $p_i < p_{\max}$ otherwise, that is, when *precisely two letters* have the maximal probability. We then have $I^* = \{1, \dots, m\} \setminus \{j, k\}$. This requires that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= t_0 = t_1 = \dots = t_{j-1}, \\ t_j &= t_{j+1} = \dots = t_{k-1}, \\ t_k &= t_{k+1} = \dots = t_m = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\substack{0=t_0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{m-1} \leq t_m=1}} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \sigma_i \tilde{B}^i(t_i) &= \max_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \left[\sum_{i=j}^{k-1} \sigma_i \tilde{B}^i(t) + \sum_{i=k}^{m-1} \sigma_i \tilde{B}^i(1) \right] \\ &= \sum_{i=k}^{m-1} \sigma_i \tilde{B}^i(1) + \max_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \sum_{i=j}^{k-1} \sigma_i \tilde{B}^i(t). \end{aligned}$$

Thus the limiting law is

$$-\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} i \sigma_i \tilde{B}_n^i(1) + \sum_{i=k}^{m-1} \sigma_i \tilde{B}^i(1) + \max_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \sum_{i=j}^{k-1} \sigma_i \tilde{B}^i(t). \quad (3.26)$$

To consolidate our analysis, we treat the general case for which $p_{\max}$ occurs exactly k times among $\{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_m\}$, where $2 \leq k \leq m-1$. Not only will we recover the natural analogues of (3.26), but we will also express our results in terms of another functional of Brownian motion which is more symmetric. Combining the $2 \leq k \leq m-1$ case at hand with the $k=1$ case previously examined, we have the following:

Corollary 3.2 *Let $p_{\max} = p_{j_1} = p_{j_2} = \dots = p_{j_k}$ for $1 \leq j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_k \leq m$, for some $1 \leq k \leq m-1$, and let $p_i < p_{\max}$, otherwise. Then*

$$\frac{LI_n - p_{\max}n}{\sqrt{n}} \Rightarrow \sqrt{p_{\max}(1 - p_{\max})} \max_{\substack{0=t_0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{k-1} \leq t_k=1}} \sum_{\ell=1}^k \left[\tilde{B}^\ell(t_\ell) - \tilde{B}^\ell(t_{\ell-1}) \right], \quad (3.27)$$

where the k -dimensional Brownian motion $(\tilde{B}^1(t), \tilde{B}^2(t), \dots, \tilde{B}^k(t))$ has the covariance matrix

$$t \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \rho & \rho & \cdots & \rho \\ \rho & 1 & \rho & & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & & \rho & 1 & \rho \\ \rho & \cdots & \cdots & \rho & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.28)$$

with $\rho = -p_{\max}/(1 - p_{\max})$.

Proof. Let $p_{\max} = p_{j_1} = p_{j_2} = \dots = p_{j_k}$, with $1 \leq j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_k \leq m$ and $2 \leq k \leq m - 1$, i.e., let $I^* = \{1, 2, \dots, m\} \setminus \{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_k\}$. Set $j_0 = 1$ and $j_{k+1} = m$. Then (3.17) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{LI_n - p_{\max}n}{\sqrt{n}} &= -\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} i \sigma_i \hat{B}_n^i(1) \\ &\quad + \max_{\substack{0=t_0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{m-1} \leq t_m=1 \\ t_i=t_{i-1}, i \in I^*}} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \sigma_i \hat{B}_n^i(t_i) + E_n \\ &= -\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} i \sigma_i \hat{B}_n^i(1) \\ &\quad + \max_{\substack{0=t_{j_0} \leq t_{j_1} \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{j_k} \leq t_{j_{k+1}}=1}} \sum_{\ell=0}^k \sum_{i=j_\ell}^{j_{\ell+1}-1} \sigma_i \hat{B}_n^i(t_{j_\ell}) + E_n \\ &= -\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} i \sigma_i \hat{B}_n^i(1) + \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \max_{\substack{0=t_{j_0} \leq t_{j_1} \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{j_k} \leq t_{j_{k+1}}=1}} \left[\sum_{\ell=1}^{k-1} \sum_{i=j_\ell}^{j_{\ell+1}-1} \sigma_i \hat{B}_n^i(t_{j_\ell}) + \sum_{i=j_k}^{m-1} \sigma_i \hat{B}_n^i(1) \right] + E_n \\
& = \left[-\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} i \sigma_i \hat{B}_n^i(1) + \sum_{i=j_k}^{m-1} \sigma_i \hat{B}_n^i(1) \right] \\
& + \max_{\substack{0=t_{j_0} \leq t_{j_1} \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{j_k} \leq t_{j_{k+1}}=1}} \sum_{\ell=1}^{k-1} \sum_{i=j_\ell}^{j_{\ell+1}-1} \sigma_i \hat{B}_n^i(t_{j_\ell}) + E_n. \tag{3.29}
\end{aligned}$$

We immediately recognize the first term on the right hand side of (3.29) as what we encountered for $k = 1$. Using the definition of the $\hat{B}_n^i$, (3.29) can then be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{a_n^{j_k} - np_{max}}{\sqrt{n}} + \max_{\substack{0=t_{j_0} \leq t_{j_1} \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{j_k} \leq t_{j_{k+1}}=1}} \sum_{\ell=1}^{k-1} \sum_{i=j_\ell}^{j_{\ell+1}-1} \sigma_i \hat{B}_n^i(t_{j_\ell}) + E_n \\
& = \frac{a_n^{j_k} - np_{max}}{\sqrt{n}} + \max_{\substack{0=t_{j_0} \leq t_{j_1} \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{j_k} \leq t_{j_{k+1}}=1}} \sum_{\ell=1}^{k-1} \sum_{i=j_\ell}^{j_{\ell+1}-1} \sigma_i \left(\frac{S_{[nt_{j_\ell}]}^i - \mu_i n}{\sigma_i \sqrt{n}} \right) + E_n \\
& = \frac{a_n^{j_k} - np_{max}}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \max_{\substack{0=t_{j_0} \leq t_{j_1} \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{j_k} \leq t_{j_{k+1}}=1}} \sum_{\ell=1}^{k-1} \left[(a_{[nt_{j_\ell}]}^{j_\ell} - a_{[nt_{j_\ell}]}^{j_{\ell+1}}) - n(p_{j_\ell} - p_{j_{\ell+1}}) \right] \\
& + E_n \\
& = \frac{a_n^{j_k} - np_{max}}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \max_{\substack{0=t_{j_0} \leq t_{j_1} \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{j_k} \leq t_{j_{k+1}}=1}} \sum_{\ell=1}^{k-1} \left[(a_{[nt_{j_\ell}]}^{j_\ell} - np_{max}) - (a_{[nt_{j_\ell}]}^{j_{\ell+1}} - np_{max}) \right] \\
& + E_n. \tag{3.30}
\end{aligned}$$

Setting $a_n^{j_{k+1}} = n - \sum_{\ell=1}^k a_n^{j_\ell}$, we note that the random vector $(a_n^{j_1}, a_n^{j_2}, \dots, a_n^{j_{k+1}})$ follows a multinomial distribution with parameters n and $(p_{max}, p_{max}, \dots, p_{max}, 1 - kp_{max})$. It is thus natural to introduce a new Brownian motion approximation as follows:

$$\check{B}_n^\ell(t) = \frac{a_r^{j_\ell} - np_{\max}}{\sqrt{np_{\max}(1-p_{\max})}}, \quad 1 \leq \ell \leq k. \quad (3.31)$$

Substituting (3.31) into (3.30) gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{p_{\max}(1-p_{\max})} \left\{ \check{B}_n^k(1) + \max_{\substack{0=t_0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{k-1} \leq t_k=1}} \sum_{\ell=1}^{k-1} [\check{B}_n^\ell(t_\ell) - \check{B}_n^{\ell+1}(t_\ell)] \right\} + E_n \\ &= \sqrt{p_{\max}(1-p_{\max})} \max_{\substack{0=t_0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{k-1} \leq t_k=1}} \sum_{\ell=1}^k [\check{B}_n^\ell(t_\ell) - \check{B}_n^\ell(t_{\ell-1})] + E_n. \end{aligned} \quad (3.32)$$

By Donsker's Theorem, our approximations $(\check{B}_n^1(t), \check{B}_n^2(t), \dots, \check{B}_n^k(t))$ converges jointly to a k -dimensional Brownian motion $(\tilde{B}^1(t), \tilde{B}^2(t), \dots, \tilde{B}^k(t))$. This Brownian motion has the covariance structure

$$t \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \rho & \rho & \cdots & \rho \\ \rho & 1 & \rho & & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & & \rho & 1 & \rho \\ \rho & \cdots & \cdots & \rho & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\rho = -p_{\max}/(1-p_{\max})$, a fact which follows immediately from the covariance of the multinomial distribution, where the covariance of any two distinct $a_r^{j_\ell}$ is simply $-rp_{\max}^2$, for $1 \leq r \leq n$. This, together with our analysis of the unique $p_{\max}$ case, proves the corollary. $\blacksquare$

Remark 3.3 *The above results provide a Brownian functional equivalent to the GUE result of Its, Tracy, and Widom [16] (described in detail in the comments preceding Theorem 3.1 and with a law given in Remark 4.4). Note that the limiting distribution in (3.27) depends only on k and $p_{\max}$; neither the specific values of $j_1, j_2, \dots, j_k$ nor the remaining values of p_i are material, a fact already noted in [16]. Also, it follows from generic results on Brownian functionals that this limiting law has a density, which in the uniform case is supported on the positive real line, while supported on all of $\mathbb{R}$ in the non-uniform case.*

We have already seen in (3.7) that the limiting distribution for the uniform case has a nice representation as a functional of standard Brownian motion. We now also express the limiting distribution in (3.27) as a functional of standard Brownian motion. Moreover, this new functional extends to the uniform case, although its form is different from that of (3.7). This limiting random variable can be viewed as the sum of a normal one and of a maximal eigenvalue type one.

Corollary 3.3 *Let $p_{max} = p_{j_1} = p_{j_2} = \dots = p_{j_k}$, for $1 \leq j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_k \leq m$, and some $1 \leq k \leq m$, and let $p_i < p_{max}$, otherwise. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{LI_n - p_{max}n}{\sqrt{n}} \Rightarrow \sqrt{p_{max}} \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{1 - kp_{max}} - 1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k B^j(1) \right. \\ \left. + \max_{\substack{0=t_0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{k-1} \leq t_k=1}} \sum_{\ell=1}^k [B^\ell(t_\ell) - B^\ell(t_{\ell-1})] \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.33)$$

where $(B^1(t), B^2(t), \dots, B^k(t))$ is a standard k -dimensional Brownian motion.

Proof. Let us first examine the non-uniform case $1 \leq k \leq m-1$. Recall that $\rho = -p_{max}/(1 - p_{max})$. Now the covariance matrix in (3.28) has eigenvalues $\lambda_1 = 1 - \rho = 1/(1 - p_{max})$ of multiplicity $k-1$ and $\lambda_2 = 1 + (k-1)\rho = (1 - kp_{max})/(1 - p_{max}) < \lambda_1$ of multiplicity 1. From the symmetries of the covariance matrix, it is not hard to see that we can write each Brownian motion $\tilde{B}^i(t)$ as a linear combination of standard Brownian motions $(B^1(t), \dots, B^k(t))$ as follows:

$$\tilde{B}^i(t) = \beta B^i(t) + \eta \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^k B^j(t), \quad i = 1, \dots, k, \quad (3.34)$$

where

$$\beta = \frac{(k-1)\sqrt{\lambda_1} + \sqrt{\lambda_2}}{k}, \quad \eta = \frac{-\sqrt{\lambda_1} + \sqrt{\lambda_2}}{k}. \quad (3.35)$$

Substituting (3.34) and (3.35) into (3.27), and noting that $\beta - \eta = \sqrt{\lambda_1} = 1/\sqrt{1 - p_{max}}$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sqrt{p_{max}(1-p_{max})} \max_{\substack{0=t_0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{k-1} \leq t_k=1}} \sum_{\ell=1}^k \left[\tilde{B}^\ell(t_\ell) - \tilde{B}^\ell(t_{\ell-1}) \right] \\
&= \sqrt{p_{max}(1-p_{max})} \max_{\substack{0=t_0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{k-1} \leq t_k=1}} \sum_{\ell=1}^k \left\{ \beta [B^\ell(t_\ell) - B^\ell(t_{\ell-1})] \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \eta \sum_{j=1, j \neq \ell}^k [B^j(t_\ell) - B^j(t_{\ell-1})] \right\} \\
&= \sqrt{p_{max}(1-p_{max})} \max_{\substack{0=t_0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{k-1} \leq t_k=1}} \sum_{\ell=1}^k \left\{ (\beta - \eta) [B^\ell(t_\ell) - B^\ell(t_{\ell-1})] \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \eta \sum_{j=1}^k [B^j(t_\ell) - B^j(t_{\ell-1})] \right\} \\
&= \sqrt{p_{max}(1-p_{max})} \max_{\substack{0=t_0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{k-1} \leq t_k=1}} \left\{ \sum_{\ell=1}^k (\beta - \eta) [B^\ell(t_\ell) - B^\ell(t_{\ell-1})] \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \eta \sum_{\ell=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^k [B^j(t_\ell) - B^j(t_{\ell-1})] \right\} \\
&= \sqrt{p_{max}(1-p_{max})} \left\{ \eta \sum_{j=1}^k B^j(1) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (\beta - \eta) \max_{\substack{0=t_0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{k-1} \leq t_k=1}} \sum_{\ell=1}^k [B^\ell(t_\ell) - B^\ell(t_{\ell-1})] \right\} \\
&= \sqrt{p_{max}} \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{1-kp_{max}}-1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k B^j(1) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \max_{\substack{0=t_0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{k-1} \leq t_k=1}} \sum_{\ell=1}^k [B^\ell(t_\ell) - B^\ell(t_{\ell-1})] \right\}. \tag{3.36}
\end{aligned}$$

To complete the proof, we now examine the uniform case $k = m$, where necessarily $p_{max} = 1/m$. Now we saw in Proposition 3.1 that

$$\frac{LI_n - n/m}{\sqrt{n}} \Rightarrow \sqrt{\frac{2}{m}} \left\{ -\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} i \tilde{B}^i(1) + \max_{\substack{0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{m-1} \leq 1}} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \tilde{B}^i(t_i) \right\}, \quad (3.37)$$

where the $(m-1)$ -dimensional Brownian motion $(\tilde{B}^1(t), \dots, \tilde{B}^{m-1}(t))$ had a tridiagonal covariance matrix given by (3.2). Now we can derive this Brownian motion from a standard m -dimensional Brownian motion $(B^1(t), \dots, B^m(t))$ via the a.s. transformations

$$\tilde{B}^i(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(B^i(t) - B^{i+1}(t)), \quad 1 \leq i \leq m-1.$$

It is easily verified that the Brownian motion $(\tilde{B}^1(t), \dots, \tilde{B}^{m-1}(t))$ so obtained does indeed have the covariance structure given by (3.2). Substituting these independent Brownian motions into (3.36), we obtain the following a.s equalities:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{LI_n - n/m}{\sqrt{n}} &\Rightarrow \sqrt{\frac{2}{m}} \left\{ -\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} i \tilde{B}^i(1) + \max_{\substack{0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{m-1} \leq 1}} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \tilde{B}^i(t_i) \right\} \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{m}} \left\{ -\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} i [B^i(1) - B^{i+1}(1)] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \max_{\substack{0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{m-1} \leq 1}} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} [B^i(t_i) - B^{i+1}(t_i)] \right\} \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{m}} \left\{ -\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m B^i(1) + B^m(1) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \max_{\substack{0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{m-1} \leq 1}} \sum_{i=1}^m [B^i(t_i) - B^i(t_{i-1})] - B^m(1) \right\} \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{m}} \left\{ -\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m B^i(1) + \max_{\substack{0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{m-1} \leq 1}} \sum_{i=1}^m [B^i(t_i) - B^i(t_{i-1})] \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.38)$$

which we recognize as (3.33), with $k = m$ and $p_{max} = 1/m$. ■

We have already seen several representations for the limiting law in the uniform case. Yet one more pleasing functional for the limiting distribution of LI_n is described in the following

Theorem 3.2 *Let $p_{\max} = p_1 = p_2 = \cdots = p_m = 1/m$. Then*

$$\frac{LI_n - n/m}{\sqrt{n}} \Rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \max_{\substack{0=t_0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{m-1} \leq t_m=1}} \sum_{i=1}^m \left[\tilde{B}^i(t_i) - \tilde{B}^i(t_{i-1}) \right] := \frac{\tilde{H}_m}{\sqrt{m}}, \quad (3.39)$$

where $(\tilde{B}^1(t), \tilde{B}^2(t), \dots, \tilde{B}^m(t))$ is an m -dimensional Brownian motion having covariance matrix (3.28), with $\rho = -1/(m-1)$. (This Brownian motion satisfies $\sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{B}^i(t) = 0$, for all $0 \leq t \leq 1$.)

Proof. We show that the functional being maximized in (3.39) has the same covariance structure as the functional being maximized in (3.7), a result which we restate as:

$$\frac{LI_n - n/m}{\sqrt{n}} \Rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \max_{\substack{0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{m-1} \leq t_m=1}} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} [\beta_i B^i(t_{i+1}) - \eta_i B^i(t_i)], \quad (3.40)$$

where $\beta_i = \sqrt{i/(i+1)}$ and $\eta_i = \sqrt{(i+1)/i}$. From this it will immediately follow that the maxima, over all $0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq \dots \leq t_{m-1} \leq 1$, in both expressions have the same law, clinching the proof.

Given that the zero-sum condition on the Brownian motion is in force in (3.39), it is natural to rewrite (3.39) as

$$\frac{LI_n - n/m}{\sqrt{n}} \Rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \max_{\substack{0=t_0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{m-1} \leq t_m=1}} \sum_{i=1}^m \left[\tilde{B}^i(t_i) - \tilde{B}^i(t_{i-1}) \right], \quad (3.41)$$

where $(\tilde{B}^1(t), \tilde{B}^2(t), \dots, \tilde{B}^m(t))$ is an m -dimensional Brownian motion with a permutation-invariant covariance matrix described by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(\tilde{B}^i(t), \tilde{B}^j(t)) &= \left(\frac{m-1}{m} \right) \frac{-t}{m-1} \\ &= -\frac{t}{m}, \quad i \neq j, \end{aligned}$$

while

$$\text{Var} \tilde{B}^i(t) = \frac{m-1}{m}t.$$

Let $t = (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{m-1})$ be a fixed collection of t_i from the Weyl chamber $T = \{(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{m-1}) : 0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq \dots \leq t_{m-1} \leq 1\}$. Setting

$$X_t = \sum_{i=1}^m \left[\tilde{B}^i(t_i) - \tilde{B}^i(t_{i-1}) \right], \quad (3.42)$$

we then have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(X_t, X_s) &= \frac{m-1}{m} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq m} \text{Cov}(\tilde{B}^i(t_i) - \tilde{B}^i(t_{i-1}), \tilde{B}^i(s_i) - \tilde{B}^i(s_{i-1})) \\ &= \frac{m-1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m [t_i \wedge s_i - t_i \wedge s_{i-1} - t_{i-1} \wedge s_i + t_{i-1} \wedge s_{i-1}] \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \neq j} [t_i \wedge s_j - t_i \wedge s_{j-1} - t_{i-1} \wedge s_j + t_{i-1} \wedge s_{j-1}]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.43)$$

We can rewrite (3.43) in an especially clear way by setting $T_1 = [0, t_1]$ and $T_i = (t_i, t_{i+1}]$, $i = 2, \dots, m$, and similarly $S_1 = [0, s_1]$ and $S_i = (s_i, s_{i+1}]$, $i = 2, \dots, m$. Letting Leb denote the Lebesgue measure on $[0, 1]$, a case-by-case analysis of the relative positions of t_i, t_{i-1}, s_i , and s_{i-1} quickly yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(X_t, X_s) &= \frac{m-1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m Leb(T_i \cap S_i) - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \neq j} Leb(T_i \cap S_j) \\ &= \frac{m-1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m Leb(T_i \cap S_i) - \frac{1}{m} \left[1 - \sum_{i=1}^m Leb(T_i \cap S_i) \right] \\ &= -\frac{1}{m} + \sum_{i=1}^m Leb(T_i \cap S_i). \end{aligned} \quad (3.44)$$

From (3.44) we clearly have $\text{Var} X_t = (m-1)/m$, for all $t \in T$. To complete the proof, we now show that

$$Y_t = \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} [\beta_i B^i(t_{i+1}) - \eta_i B^i(t_i)], \quad (3.45)$$

has the same covariance structure as X_t , where $\beta_i = \sqrt{i/(i+1)}$ and $\eta_i = \sqrt{(i+1)/i}$. Using the independence of the components of the Brownian motion, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(Y_t, Y_s) &= \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \text{Cov}(\beta_i B^i(t_{i+1}) - \eta_i B^i(t_i), \beta_i B^i(s_{i+1}) - \eta_i B^i(s_i)) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \left[\frac{i}{i+1} (t_{i+1} \wedge s_{i+1}) - t_{i+1} \wedge s_i - t_i \wedge s_{i+1} + \frac{i+1}{i} (t_i \wedge s_i) \right] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{i-1}{i} t_i \wedge s_i - \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \left[t_{i+1} \wedge s_i - t_i \wedge s_{i+1} - \frac{i+1}{i} t_i \wedge s_i \right] \\ &= \frac{m-1}{m} - \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} [t_{i+1} \wedge s_i - t_i \wedge s_{i+1} - 2(t_i \wedge s_i)]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.46)$$

As before, a simple case-by-case analysis of the summands in (3.46) reveals that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(Y_t, Y_s) &= \frac{m-1}{m} - \left[1 - \sum_{i=1}^m \text{Leb}(T_i \cap S_i) \right] \\ &= -\frac{1}{m} + \sum_{i=1}^m \text{Leb}(T_i \cap S_i), \end{aligned} \quad (3.47)$$

completing the proof. ■

4 Large- m Asymptotics and Related Results

With the covariance structure of X_t now in hand, we can compute the L^2 -distance between any X_t and X_s :

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(X_t - X_s)^2 &= \text{Var } X_t + \text{Var } X_s - 2 \text{Cov}(X_t, X_s) \\
&= 2(1 - 1/m) - 2 \left[-1/m + \sum_{i=1}^m \text{Leb}(T_i \cap S_i) \right] \\
&= 2 \left[1 - \sum_{i=1}^m \text{Leb}(T_i \cap S_i) \right]. \tag{4.1}
\end{aligned}$$

Such a metric is useful, for instance, in applying Dudley's Entropy Bound to show that

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\max_{\substack{0=t_0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{m-1} \leq t_m=1}} X_t \right) \leq K \sqrt{m-1},$$

for some constant K not depending on m .

We can now more clearly see the similarities between the functional D_m of Glynn and Whitt in (3.8) and that of (3.7), which we have shown to have the same law as $\tilde{H}_m$ in (3.39). Indeed, the only difference between the functionals is simply that in (3.8) the Brownian motions are independent, while in (3.39) they are subject to the zero-sum constraint. Gravner, Tracy, and Widom [9] have already remarked that random words could be studied via such Brownian functionals. In fact, a restatement of Corollary 3.3 shows that, in law, D_m and $\tilde{H}_m$ differ by a centered normal random variable, as indicated by the next theorem and corollary. This, in turn, will allow us to clearly state asymptotic results for $\tilde{H}_m$ from the known corresponding results for D_m .

Theorem 4.1 *Let*

$$H_m = \sqrt{2} \left\{ -\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} i \tilde{B}^i(1) + \max_{\substack{0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{m-1} \leq 1}} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \tilde{B}^i(t_i) \right\},$$

$m \geq 2$, and let $\tilde{H}_1 \equiv 0$ a.s., where $(\tilde{B}^1(t), \dots, \tilde{B}^{m-1}(t))$ is an $(m-1)$ -dimensional Brownian motion with tridiagonal covariance matrix given by (3.2). Let

$$D_m = \max_{\substack{0=t_0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{m-1} \leq t_m=1}} \sum_{i=1}^m [B^i(t_i) - B^i(t_{i-1})],$$

where $(B^1(t), \dots, B^m(t))$ is a standard m -dimensional Brownian motion. Then $D_m = Z_m + H_m$ a.s., where Z_m is a centered normal random variable with variance $1/m$, and in fact is given by $Z_m = (1/m) \sum_{i=1}^m B^i(1)$.

Proof. The $m = 1$ case is trivial. For $m \geq 2$, reformulating the proof of Corollary 3.3, for the uniform case, in terms of the functionals H_m and D_m shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{H_m}{\sqrt{m}} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \left(-\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m B^i(1) + D_m \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} (-Z_m + D_m), \end{aligned}$$

almost surely, and hence $D_m = Z_m + H_m$ a.s. ■

Recalling the definition of $\tilde{H}_m$ from Theorem 3.2:

$$\tilde{H}_m := \max_{\substack{0=t_0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{m-1} \leq t_m=1}} \sum_{i=1}^m \left[\tilde{B}^i(t_i) - \tilde{B}^i(t_{i-1}) \right],$$

where $(\tilde{B}^1(t), \tilde{B}^2(t), \dots, \tilde{B}^m(t))$ is an m -dimensional Brownian motion having covariance matrix (3.28), with $\rho = -1/(m-1)$, i.e., $\sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{B}^i(t) = 0$, for all $0 \leq t \leq 1$, we then have

Corollary 4.1 *For each $m \geq 1$, $\tilde{H}_m \stackrel{d}{=} D_m + Z_m$, where d denotes equality in distribution.*

Proof. Proposition 3.1 asserts that

$$\frac{LI_n - n/m}{\sqrt{n}} \Rightarrow \frac{H_m}{\sqrt{m}},$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, while by Theorem 3.2

$$\frac{LI_n - n/m}{\sqrt{n}} \Rightarrow \frac{\tilde{H}_m}{\sqrt{m}},$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ as well. The conclusion follows from the previous theorem. ■

This relationship between $\tilde{H}_m$ (resp., H_m) and D_m allows us to further express the limiting distribution in a rather compact form.

Proposition 4.1 *Let $p_{\max} = p_{j_1} = p_{j_2} = \cdots = p_{j_k}$, for $1 \leq j_1 < j_2 < \cdots < j_k \leq m$, and some $1 \leq k \leq m$, and let $p_i < p_{\max}$, otherwise. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{LI_n - p_{\max}n}{\sqrt{n}} &\Rightarrow \sqrt{p_{\max}} \{ \sqrt{1 - kp_{\max}} Z_k + H_k \} \\ &\stackrel{d}{=} \sqrt{p_{\max}} \{ \sqrt{1 - kp_{\max}} Z_k + \tilde{H}_k \}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. For $k = m$, we have $p_{\max} = 1/m$, and thus simply recover the limiting distribution $H_m/\sqrt{m} \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{H}_m/\sqrt{m}$ of the uniform case.

For $1 \leq k \leq m - 1$, we saw in Corollary 3.3 that we could write the limiting law of $(LI_n - p_{\max}n)/\sqrt{n}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{p_{\max}} \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{1 - kp_{\max}} - 1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k B^j(1) \right. \\ \left. + \max_{\substack{0=t_0 \leq t_1 \leq \cdots \\ \leq t_{k-1} \leq t_k=1}} \sum_{\ell=1}^k [B^\ell(t_\ell) - B^\ell(t_{\ell-1})] \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

where $(B^1(t), B^2(t), \dots, B^k(t))$ is a standard k -dimensional Brownian motion. But, recalling the definitions of D_k and Z_k , and the fact that $D_k = Z_k + H_k$ a.s., (4.2) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} &\sqrt{p_{\max}} \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{1 - kp_{\max}} - 1}{k} (kZ_k) + D_k \right\} \\ &= \sqrt{p_{\max}} \left\{ \left(\sqrt{1 - kp_{\max}} - 1 \right) Z_k + (Z_k + H_k) \right\} \\ &= \sqrt{p_{\max}} \left\{ \sqrt{1 - kp_{\max}} Z_k + H_k \right\} \\ &\stackrel{d}{=} \sqrt{p_{\max}} \left\{ \sqrt{1 - kp_{\max}} Z_k + \tilde{H}_k \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

■

Remark 4.1 *One might also write the limiting law of Proposition 4.1 in terms of the functional D_k . Indeed, we have*

$$\frac{LI_n - p_{\max}n}{\sqrt{p_{\max}n}} \Rightarrow (\sqrt{1 - kp_{\max}} - 1)Z_k + D_k,$$

so that the limiting law is expressed as the sum of a centered normal random variable and of the maximal eigenvalue of a $k \times k$ element of the GUE.

The behavior of D_m has been well-studied. In particular, it is known that $D_m/\sqrt{m} \rightarrow 2$ a.s. and in L^1 , as $m \rightarrow \infty$ (see [4, 8, 12, 22, 23, 26]), and that $(D_m - 2\sqrt{m})m^{1/6} \Rightarrow F_2$, as $m \rightarrow \infty$, where F_2 is the Tracy-Widom distribution (see [4, 9, 27, 28]). From these results, the asymptotics of H_m follows.

Theorem 4.2 *We have that*

$$\frac{H_m}{\sqrt{m}} \rightarrow 2$$

a.s. and in L^1 , as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover,

$$\left(\frac{H_m}{\sqrt{m}} - 2 \right) m^{2/3} \Rightarrow F_2, \quad (4.4)$$

where F_2 is the Tracy-Widom distribution. The same statements hold for $\tilde{H}_m$ in place of H_m .

Proof. From Theorem 4.1 we have $D_m = Z_m + H_m$ a.s., where $Z_m = (1/m) \sum_{i=1}^m B^i(1)$.

Clearly, $Z_m \rightarrow 0$ a.s. and in L^1 . Thus, a.s. and in L^1 ,

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{H_m}{\sqrt{m}} = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{D_m}{\sqrt{m}}.$$

Since this last limit is 2, and since, for each $m \geq 1$, $H_m \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{H}_m$, it also follows that

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{\tilde{H}_m}{\sqrt{m}} - 2 \right| = 0.$$

We are thus left with proving the a.s. convergence to 2 of $\tilde{H}_m/\sqrt{m}$. Since the variance of the functional being maximized in the definition of $\tilde{H}_m$ equals $1 - 1/m$, the Gaussian concentration inequality then implies that

$$\mathbb{P}(|\tilde{H}_m - \mathbb{E}\tilde{H}_m| > h) \leq 2e^{\frac{-h^2}{2(1-\frac{1}{m})}} < 2e^{\frac{-h^2}{2}}$$

for all $h > 0$. Then since $\mathbb{E}\tilde{H}_m/\sqrt{m} \rightarrow 2$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$ we have for m large enough that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{\tilde{H}_m}{\sqrt{m}} - 2\right| > h\right) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(|\tilde{H}_m - \mathbb{E}\tilde{H}_m| > \sqrt{m}\left(h - \left|\frac{\mathbb{E}\tilde{H}_m}{\sqrt{m}} - 2\right|\right)\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(|\tilde{H}_m - \mathbb{E}\tilde{H}_m| > \frac{\sqrt{m}h}{2}\right) \\ &< 2e^{\frac{-mh^2}{8}} \end{aligned}$$

This concentration result implies that

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{\tilde{H}_m}{\sqrt{m}} - 2\right| > h\right) \leq \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} 2e^{\frac{-mh^2}{8}} < \infty,$$

and the Borel-Cantelli lemma allows us to conclude the proof of a.s. convergence.

Turning to the limiting law, we know ([4, 9]) that D_m has the same distribution as the largest eigenvalue of the $m \times m$ GUE. Then the fundamental random matrix theory result of Tracy and Widom [28] implies that

$$\left(\frac{D_m}{\sqrt{m}} - 2\right)m^{2/3} \Rightarrow F_2.$$

Since, moreover, $D_m = Z_m + H_m$, and since Z_m has variance $1/m$, $Z_m m^{1/6} \Rightarrow 0$, and so

$$\left(\frac{H_m}{\sqrt{m}} - 2\right)m^{2/3} = \left(\frac{D_m}{\sqrt{m}} - 2\right)m^{2/3} - Z_m m^{1/6} \Rightarrow F_2.$$

Finally, $H_m \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{H}_m$, and the same result holds for $\tilde{H}_m$ in place of H_m . ■

Remark 4.2 (i) In the conclusion to [27], Tracy and Widom already derived (4.4) by applying a scaling argument to the limiting distribution of the uniform alphabet case. In our case we can moreover assert that a.s. and in the mean,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{LI_n - p_{\max}n}{\sqrt{kp_{\max}n}} = 2,$$

and that

$$\left(\frac{LI_n - p_{\max}n}{\sqrt{kp_{\max}n}} - 2 \right) k^{2/3} \Rightarrow F_2,$$

where the weak limit is first taken over n and then over k .

(ii) Using scaling, subadditivity, and concentration arguments found in Hambly, Martin, and O'Connell [12] and in O'Connell and Yor [22], one could prove directly that $\tilde{H}_m/\sqrt{m} \rightarrow 2$ a.s. This could be accomplished by studying, as do these authors, a process version of $\tilde{H}_m$, i.e.,

$$\tilde{H}_m(\varepsilon) := \max_{\substack{0=t_0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq t_{m-1} \leq t_m = \varepsilon}} \sum_{i=1}^m \left[\tilde{B}^i(t_i) - \tilde{B}^i(t_{i-1}) \right],$$

for $\varepsilon > 0$. With obvious notations, for all $\varepsilon > 0$ and $m \geq 1$, $D_m(\varepsilon) = Z(\varepsilon) + H_m(\varepsilon)$, a.s., where $Z(\varepsilon) = (1/m) \sum_{i=1}^m B^i(\varepsilon)$.

To see in further detail how D_m and $\tilde{H}_m$ are related, first note that $D_m \leq D_{m+1}$ a.s. for $m \geq 1$, since D_m can simply be obtained by restricting the right-most parameter t_m to be 1 in the definition of D_{m+1} . We now show a stochastic domination result between D_m and $\tilde{H}_m$.

Recall that a random variable X is said to *stochastically dominate* another random variable Y (i.e., $X \geq_{st} Y$) if for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ we have $\mathbb{P}(X \geq x) \geq \mathbb{P}(Y \geq x)$.

Proposition 4.2 $\tilde{H}_m \geq_{st} \sqrt{(1 - 1/m)} D_m$, for $m \geq 1$. The same statement holds for H_m in place of $\tilde{H}_m$.

Proof. Since the $m = 1$ case is trivial, let $m \geq 2$. We saw in (3.44) that the functional X_t being maximized in the definition of $\tilde{H}_m$ had a covariance structure given by $\text{Cov}(X_t, X_s) = -1/m + \sum_{i=1}^m \text{Leb}(T_i \cap S_i)$. A similar argument shows that the functional $U_t = \sum_{i=1}^m [B^i(t_i) - B^i(t_{i-1})]$ which is

being maximized in the definition of D_m has a covariance structure given by $\text{Cov}(U_t, U_s) = \sum_{i=1}^m \text{Leb}(T_i \cap S_i)$. Therefore,

$$\text{Var}(\sqrt{(1 - 1/m)}U_t) = \text{Var}X_t = 1 - 1/m,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(\sqrt{(1 - 1/m)}U_t, \sqrt{(1 - 1/m)}U_s) &= (1 - 1/m) \sum_{i=1}^m \text{Leb}(T_i \cap S_i) \\ &\geq \text{Cov}(X_t, X_s). \end{aligned}$$

By Slepian's Lemma we conclude that $\tilde{H}_m \geq_{st} \sqrt{(1 - 1/m)}D_m$. The final assertion follows from the equality in law between $\tilde{H}_m$ and H_m . $\blacksquare$

Remark 4.3 *Note that*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(X_t - X_s)^2 &= \mathbb{E}(\sqrt{(1 - 1/m)}U_t - \sqrt{(1 - 1/m)}U_s)^2 \\ &= 2 \left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^m \text{Leb}(T_i \cap S_i) \right) \end{aligned}$$

for all $s, t \in [0, 1]$. That is, while X_t and $\sqrt{(1 - 1/m)}U_t$ have different covariance structures, their L^2 -structures are identical. The Sudakov-Fernique Inequality then allows us to conclude again that $\mathbb{E}\tilde{H}_m = \mathbb{E}D_m$ in a manner independent of the development of Theorem 4.1.

Remark 4.4 *Let us briefly summarize the connections between random matrix theory and the Brownian functionals encountered in this paper. Writing $x^{(m)} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m)$, and defining $\Delta(x) = \Pi_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} (x_i - x_j)$ to be the Vandermonde determinant, we have the following facts.*

(i) $D_m \stackrel{d}{=} \lambda_1^{(m)}$, where $\lambda_1^{(m)}$ is the largest eigenvalue of the $m \times m$ GUE, with the scaling taken to be such that the diagonal elements $X_{i,i}$ satisfy $\mathbb{E}X_{i,i}^2 = 1$, and the off-diagonal elements $X_{i,j}$, for $i \neq j$, satisfy $\mathbb{E}|X_{i,j}|^2 = 1$. Using standard random matrix results (see, e.g., [21]), the distribution of D_m , for all $m \geq 1$ and all $s \in \mathbb{R}$, is given by

$$\mathbb{P}(D_m \leq s) = c_m \int_{A_s} e^{-\sum_{i=1}^m x_i^2/2} \Delta(x)^2 dx^{(m)},$$

where

$$A_s = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^m : \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} x_i \leq s\},$$

where

$$c_m^{-1} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} e^{-\sum_{i=1}^m x_i^2/2} \Delta(x)^2 dx^{(m)}.$$

(ii) $\tilde{H}_m \stackrel{d}{=} \lambda_1^{(m,0)}$, where $\lambda_1^{(m,0)}$ is the largest eigenvalue of the $m \times m$ traceless GUE, with the scaling as in (i). Using the joint density of the eigenvalues of the traceless $m \times m$ GUE [21, 27], the distribution function of $\tilde{H}_m$ can also be computed directly, for all $m \geq 2$ and all $s \geq 0$, as

$$\mathbb{P}(\tilde{H}_m \leq s) = c_m^0 \int_{A_s^0} e^{-(m/2) \sum_{i=1}^m x_i^2} \Delta(x)^2 dx^{(m,0)},$$

where $dx^{(m,0)}$ is Lebesgue measure over the set $\{\sum_{i=1}^m x_i = 0\}$, and where

$$A_s^0 = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^m : \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} x_i \leq s\} \cap \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^m x_i = 0 \right\},$$

where

$$(c_m^0)^{-1} = \int_{\{\sum_{i=1}^m x_i = 0\}} e^{-(m/2) \sum_{i=1}^m x_i^2} \Delta(x)^2 dx^{(m,0)}.$$

Note that $\tilde{H}_m$ is a.s. non-negative, and so $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{H}_m \leq s) = 0$, for all $s < 0$.

(iii) $J_m := \sqrt{p_{\max}} \{\sqrt{1 - kp_{\max}} Z_k + \tilde{H}_k\}$, the limiting functional of Proposition 4.1 for the m -letter non-uniform case, having its most probable letters of multiplicity k occuring with probability $p_{\max}$, is equal in law to the sum of a normal random variable and a variable whose distribution, up to the scaling factor $\sqrt{p_{\max}}$, is that of the largest eigenvalue of the $k \times k$ traceless GUE, with the scaling as in (i) and (ii). (Note also that since $D_m \stackrel{d}{=} Z_m + \tilde{H}_m$, J_m is also equal in law to the sum of a normal random variable and a variable whose distribution, up to the scaling factor $\sqrt{p_{\max}}$, is that of the largest

eigenvalue of the $k \times k$ GUE.) Its, Tracy, and Widom [16] show that, for all $m \geq 2$ and all $s \in \mathbb{R}$, J_m has distribution given by

$$\mathbb{P}(J_m \leq s) = c_{k,p_{\max}} \int_{A_s} e^{-\frac{1}{2p_{\max}} [\sum_{i=1}^k x_i^2 + \frac{p_{\max}}{1-kp_{\max}} (\sum_{i=1}^k x_i)^2]} \Delta(x)^2 dx^{(k)},$$

where

$$A_s = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^k : \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} x_i \leq s\},$$

and where

$$c_{k,p_{\max}}^{-1} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^k} e^{-\frac{1}{2p_{\max}} [\sum_{i=1}^k x_i^2 + \frac{p_{\max}}{1-kp_{\max}} (\sum_{i=1}^k x_i)^2]} \Delta(x)^2 dx^{(k)}.$$

Moreover, in the discussion prior to Theorem 3.1, we noted that the k -fold integral representation of the limiting distribution of J_m came from simplifying a more complex expression. This expression described the distribution of J_m as that of largest eigenvalue of the direct sum of d mutually independent GUEs, each of size $k_j \times k_j$, $1 \leq j \leq d$, subject to the eigenvalue constraint $\sum_{i=1}^m \sqrt{p_i} \lambda_i = 0$. Here the k_j were the multiplicities of the probabilities having common values, the p_i were ordered in decreasing order, and the eigenvalues were ordered in terms of the GUEs corresponding to the appropriate values of p_i .

Note that when $k = 1$, the limiting distribution becomes simply

$$\mathbb{P}(J_m \leq s) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi p_{\max}(1-p_{\max})}} \int_{-\infty}^s e^{-x^2/2p_{\max}(1-p_{\max})} dx,$$

which is simply a $N(0, p_{\max}(1-p_{\max}))$ distribution.

(iv) The Tracy-Widom distribution function F_2 , which also describes the limiting distribution of $(L\sigma_n - 2\sqrt{n})/n^{1/6}$, (see [3]), is given, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, by

$$F_2(t) = \exp \left(- \int_t^\infty (x-t)u^2(x)dx \right),$$

where $u(x)$ is the solution to the Painlevé II equation $u_{xx} = 2u^3 + xu$ with $u(x) \sim -Ai(x)$, as $x \rightarrow \infty$, where Ai is the Airy function.

5 Countable Infinite Alphabets

Let us now study the problem of describing LI_n for an ordered, countably infinite alphabet $\mathcal{A} = \{\alpha_n\}_{n \geq 1}$, where $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \dots < \alpha_m < \dots$. Let $(X_i)_{i=1}^n$, $X_i \in \mathcal{A}$, be an iid sequence, with $\mathbb{P}(X_1 = \alpha_r) = p_r > 0$, for $r \geq 1$.

The central idea in the first part of our approach is to introduce two new sequences derived from $(X_i)_{i=1}^n$. Fix $m \geq 1$. The first sequence, which we shall term the *capped sequence*, is defined by taking $T_i^m = X_i \wedge \alpha_m$, for $i \geq 1$. The second one, $(Y_i^m)_{i=1}^{N_{n,m}}$, the *reduced sequence*, consists of the subsequence of $(X_i)_{i=1}^n$ of length $N_{n,m}$, for which $X_i \leq \alpha_m$, for $i \geq 1$. Thus, the capped sequence $(T_i^m)_{i=1}^n$ is obtained by setting to α_m all letter values greater than α_m , while the reduced sequence $(Y_i^m)_{i=1}^{N_{n,m}}$ is obtained by eliminating letter values greater than α_m altogether.

Let $LI_{n,m}^{cap}$ and $LI_{n,m}^{red}$ to be the lengths of the longest increasing subsequence of $(T_i^m)_{i=1}^n$ and $(Y_i^m)_{i=1}^{N_{n,m}}$, respectively. Now on the one hand, any subsequence of the reduced sequence is again a subsequence of the original sequence $(X_i)_{i=1}^n$. On the other hand, any increasing subsequence of $(X_i)_{i=1}^n$ is again an increasing subsequence of the capped one. These two observations lead to the pathwise bounds

$$LI_{n,m}^{red} \leq LI_n \leq LI_{n,m}^{cap}, \quad (5.1)$$

for all $m \geq 1$ and $n \geq 1$.

These bounds suggest that the behavior of the iid infinite case perhaps mirrors that of the iid finite-alphabet case. Indeed, we do have the following result, which amounts to an extension of Theorem 3.1 (or, more precisely, of Proposition 4.1) to the iid infinite-alphabet case.

Theorem 5.1 *Let $(X_i)_{i \geq 1}$ be a sequence of iid random variables taking values in the ordered alphabet $\mathcal{A} = \{\alpha_n\}_{n \geq 1}$. Let $\mathbb{P}(X_1 = \alpha_j) = p_j$, for $j \geq 1$. Let $p_{max} = p_{j_1} = p_{j_2} = \dots = p_{j_k}$, $1 \leq j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_k$, $k \geq 1$, and let $p_i < p_{max}$, otherwise. Then*

$$\frac{LI_n - p_{max}n}{\sqrt{n}} \Rightarrow \sqrt{p_{max}} \{ \sqrt{1 - p_{max}} k Z_k + H_k \} := R(p_{max}, k).$$

The proof of the theorem relies on an understanding of the limiting distributions of $LI_{n,m}^{red}$ and $LI_{n,m}^{cap}$. To this end, let us introduce some more notation.

For a finite m -alphabet, and for $V_1, \dots, V_n$ iid with $\mathbb{P}(V_1 = \alpha_r) = q_r > 0$, let $LI_n(q) := LI_n(q_1, \dots, q_m)$ denote the length of the longest increasing subsequence of $(V_i)_{i=1}^n$. For each $m \geq 1$, let also $\pi_m = \sum_{r=1}^m p_r$.

First, let us choose m large enough so that $1 - \pi_{m-1} < p_{max}$. Next, observe that, from the capping at α_m , $LI_{n,m}^{cap}$ is distributed as $LI_n(\tilde{p})$, where $\tilde{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_{m-1}, 1 - \pi_{m-1})$. But since m is chosen large enough, the maximal probability among the entries of $\tilde{p}$ is then p_{max} , of multiplicity k , as for the original infinite alphabet. By Theorem 3.1, we thus have

$$\frac{LI_n(\tilde{p}) - p_{max}n}{\sqrt{n}} \Rightarrow R(p_{max}, k), \quad (5.2)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Turning to $LI_{n,m}^{red}$, suppose that the number of elements $N_{n,m}$ of the reduced subsequence $(Y_i^m)_{i=1}^{N_{n,m}}$ is equal to j . Since only the elements of $(X_i)_{i=1}^n$ which are at most α_m are left, $LI_{n,m}^{red}$ must be distributed as $LI_j(\hat{p})$, where $\hat{p} = (p_1/\pi_m, \dots, p_m/\pi_m)$. From the way m is chosen, the maximal probability among the entries of $\hat{p}$ is then p_{max}/π_m , of multiplicity k . Invoking again the finite-alphabet result of Theorem 3.1, we find that

$$\frac{LI_n(\hat{p}) - (p_{max}/\pi_m)n}{\sqrt{n}} \Rightarrow R\left(\frac{p_{max}}{\pi_m}, k\right), \quad (5.3)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

We now relate the two limiting expressions in (5.2) and (5.3) by the following elementary lemma.

Lemma 5.1 *Let $k \geq 1$ be an integer, and let $(q_m)_{m=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of reals in $(0, 1/k]$ converging to $q \geq 0$. Then $R(q_m, k) \Rightarrow R(q, k)$, as $m \rightarrow \infty$.*

Proof. Assume $q > 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} R(q_m, k) &= \sqrt{q_m} \left\{ \sqrt{1 - q_m k} Z_k + H_k \right\} \\ &= \sqrt{q_m} \{ \sqrt{1 - q k} Z_k + H_k \} \\ &\quad + \sqrt{q_m} \{ \sqrt{1 - q_m k} - \sqrt{1 - q k} \} Z_k \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{q_m}{q}} R(q, k) + c_m Z_k, \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

where $c_m = \sqrt{1 - q_m k} - \sqrt{1 - qk}$. Since $q_m \rightarrow q$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$, $c_m \rightarrow 0$, and so $c_m Z_k \Rightarrow 0$, as $m \rightarrow \infty$. This gives the result. The degenerate case, $q = 0$, is clear. $\blacksquare$

The main idea developed in the proof of Theorem 5.1 is now to use the basic inequality (5.1) in conjunction with a conditioning argument for $LI_{n,m}^{red}$, in order to apply Lemma 5.1, *i.e.*, to use $R(p_{max}/\pi_m, k) \Rightarrow R(p_{max}, k)$, as $m \rightarrow \infty$, since $\pi_m \rightarrow 1$.

Proof. (Theorem 5.1) First, fix an arbitrary $s > 0$. As previously noted in Remark 3.3, $R(p_{max}, k)$ has a density supported on $\mathbb{R}$ ($\mathbb{R}^+$ in the uniform case), and so s is a continuity point of its distribution function. Next, choose $0 < \epsilon_1 < 1$, and $0 < \delta < 1$, and again note that $(1 + \delta)s$ is also necessarily a continuity point for $R(p_{max}, k)$.

With this choice of ϵ_1 , pick $\beta > 0$ such that $\mathbb{P}(Z \geq \beta) < \epsilon_1/2$, where Z is a standard normal random variable. Finally, pick ϵ_2 such that $0 < \epsilon_2 < \epsilon_1 \mathbb{P}(R(p_{max}, k) < (1 + \delta)s)$. Such a choice of ϵ_2 can always be made since the support of $R(p_{max}, k)$ includes $\mathbb{R}^+$.

We have seen that, for m large enough, we can bring some finite-alphabet results to bear on the infinite case. In fact, we need a few more technical requirements on m to complete our proof. Setting $\sigma_m^2 = \pi_m(1 - \pi_m)$, we choose large enough m so that:

- (i) $1 - \pi_{m-1} < p_{max}$,
- (ii) $(s + p_{max}\beta\sigma_m/\pi_m)/\sqrt{\pi_m - \beta\sigma_m} < (1 + \delta)s$, and
- (iii) $|\mathbb{P}(R(p_{max}, k) < (1 + \delta)s) - \mathbb{P}(R(p_{max}/\pi_m, k) < (1 + \delta)s)| < \epsilon_2/2$.

The conditions (i) and (ii) are clearly satisfied, since $\pi_m \rightarrow 1$ and $\sigma_m \rightarrow 0$, as $m \rightarrow \infty$. The condition (iii) is also satisfied, as seen by applying Lemma 5.1 to $R(p_{max}/\pi_m, k)$, with $\pi_m \rightarrow 1$, and since $(1 + \delta)s$ is also a continuity point for $R(p_{max}, k)$.

Now recall that $LI_{n,m}^{cap}$ is distributed as $LI_n(\tilde{p})$, where $\tilde{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_{m-1}, 1 - \pi_{m-1})$. Hence, we have from (5.1) and (5.2) that

$$\frac{LI_n - p_{max}n}{\sqrt{n}} \leq \frac{LI_{n,m}^{cap} - p_{max}n}{\sqrt{n}} \Rightarrow R(p_{max}, k), \quad (5.5)$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{LI_n - p_{max}n}{\sqrt{n}} \leq s\right) &\geq \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{LI_{n,m}^{cap} - p_{max}n}{\sqrt{n}} \leq s\right) \\ &\rightarrow \mathbb{P}(R(p_{max}, k) \leq s), \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ (and, in fact, for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$).

More work is required to make use of the left-most minorization in (5.1) (*i.e.*, $LI_{n,m}^{red} \leq LI_n$.) Recall that if the length $N_{n,m}$ of the reduced sequence is equal to j , then $LI_{n,m}^{red}$ must be distributed as $LI_j(\hat{p})$, where $\hat{p} = (p_1/\pi_m, \dots, p_m/\pi_m)$. Now the essential observation is that $N_{n,m}$ is distributed as a binomial random variable with parameters π_m and n . It is thus natural to focus on the values of j close to $\mathbb{E}N_{n,m} = n\pi_m$. Writing the variance of $N_{n,m}$ as $n\sigma_m^2$, where, as above, $\sigma_m^2 = \pi_m(1 - \pi_m)$, and

$$\gamma_{n,m,j} := \mathbb{P}(N_{n,m} = j) = \binom{n}{j} \pi_m^j (1 - \pi_m)^{n-j},$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{LI_{n,m}^{red} - p_{max}n}{\sqrt{n}} \leq s\right) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^n \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{LI_{n,m}^{red} - p_{max}n}{\sqrt{n}} \leq s \mid N_{n,m} = j\right) \gamma_{n,m,j} \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^n \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{LI_j(\hat{p}) - p_{max}n}{\sqrt{n}} \leq s\right) \gamma_{n,m,j} \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^n \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{LI_j(\hat{p}) - \frac{p_{max}}{\pi_m}j}{\sqrt{j}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{n}{j}} \left(s + \frac{p_{max}}{\sqrt{n}} \left(n - \frac{j}{\pi_m}\right)\right)\right) \gamma_{n,m,j} \\ &\leq \sum_{j=\lceil n\pi_m - \beta\sigma_m\sqrt{n} \rceil}^n \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{LI_j(\hat{p}) - \frac{p_{max}}{\pi_m}j}{\sqrt{j}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{n}{j}} \left(s + \frac{p_{max}}{\sqrt{n}} \left(n - \frac{j}{\pi_m}\right)\right)\right) \gamma_{n,m,j} \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=0}^{\lceil n\pi_m - \beta\sigma_m\sqrt{n} \rceil - 1} \gamma_{n,m,j} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&< \sum_{j=\lceil n\pi_m - \beta\sigma_m\sqrt{n} \rceil}^n \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{LI_j(\hat{p}) - \frac{p_{max}}{\pi_m}j}{\sqrt{j}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{n}{j}} \left(s + \frac{p_{max}}{\sqrt{n}} \left(n - \frac{j}{\pi_m} \right) \right) \right) \gamma_{n,m,j} \\
&\quad + \epsilon_1,
\end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

for sufficiently large n , where (5.7) follows from the Central Limit Theorem and our choice of β , and where, as usual, $\lceil \cdot \rceil$ is the ceiling function.

Next, note that for $\lceil n\pi_m - \beta\sigma_m\sqrt{n} \rceil \leq j \leq n$, and by condition (ii),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sqrt{\frac{n}{j}} \left(s + \frac{p_{max}}{\sqrt{n}} \left(n - \frac{j}{\pi_m} \right) \right) \\
&< \sqrt{\frac{n}{n\pi_m - \beta\sigma_m\sqrt{n}}} \left(s + \frac{p_{max}}{\sqrt{n}} \left(n - \frac{n\pi_m - \beta\sigma_m\sqrt{n}}{\pi_m} \right) \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi_m - \beta\sigma_m/\sqrt{n}}} \left(s + \frac{p_{max}\beta\sigma_m}{\pi_m} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi_m - \beta\sigma_m}} \left(s + \frac{p_{max}\beta\sigma_m}{\pi_m} \right) \\
&< s(1 + \delta).
\end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

Hence, for sufficiently large n , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{j=\lceil n\pi_m - \beta\sigma_m\sqrt{n} \rceil}^n \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{LI_j(\hat{p}) - \frac{p_{max}}{\pi_m}j}{\sqrt{j}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{n}{j}} \left(s + \frac{p_{max}}{\sqrt{n}} \left(n - \frac{j}{\pi_m} \right) \right) \right) \gamma_{n,m,j} \\
&\quad + \epsilon_1 \\
&\leq \sum_{j=\lceil n\pi_m - \beta\sigma_m\sqrt{n} \rceil}^n \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{LI_j(\hat{p}) - \frac{p_{max}}{\pi_m}j}{\sqrt{j}} \leq s(1 + \delta) \right) \gamma_{n,m,j} + \epsilon_1.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.9}$$

Now from the condition (iii), and from the weak convergence, as $j \rightarrow \infty$, of $(LI_j(\hat{p}) - (p_{max}/\pi_m)j)/\sqrt{j}$ to $R(p_{max}/\pi_m, k)$, we find that, for j large enough,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{LI_j(\hat{p}) - \frac{p_{max}}{\pi_m} j}{\sqrt{j}} \leq (1 + \delta)s \right) - \mathbb{P}(R(p_{max}, k) \leq (1 + \delta)s) \right| \\
& \leq \left| \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{LI_j(\hat{p}) - \frac{p_{max}}{\pi_m} j}{\sqrt{j}} \leq (1 + \delta)s \right) - \mathbb{P} \left(R \left(\frac{p_{max}}{\pi_m}, k \right) \leq (1 + \delta)s \right) \right| \\
& \quad + \left| \mathbb{P}(R(p_{max}, k) \leq (1 + \delta)s) - \mathbb{P} \left(R \left(\frac{p_{max}}{\pi_m}, k \right) \leq (1 + \delta)s \right) \right| \\
& < \frac{\epsilon_2}{2} + \frac{\epsilon_2}{2} \\
& < \epsilon_1 \mathbb{P}(R(p_{max}, k) \leq (1 + \delta)s), \tag{5.10}
\end{aligned}$$

and so,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\frac{LI_j(\hat{p}) - \frac{p_{max}}{\pi_m} j}{\sqrt{j}} \leq (1 + \delta)s \right) \leq (1 + \epsilon_1) \mathbb{P}(R(p_{max}, k) \leq (1 + \delta)s). \tag{5.11}$$

Now since $\lceil n\pi_m - \beta\sigma_m\sqrt{n} \rceil \rightarrow \infty$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, with the help of (5.9) and (5.11), (5.7) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{LI_{n,m}^{red} - p_{max}n}{\sqrt{n}} \leq s \right) \\
& \leq \sum_{j=\lceil n\pi_m - \beta\sigma_m\sqrt{n} \rceil}^n (1 + \epsilon_1) \mathbb{P}(R(p_{max}, k) \leq (1 + \delta)s) \gamma_{n,m,j} + \epsilon_1 \\
& \leq (1 + \epsilon_1) \mathbb{P}(R(p_{max}, k) \leq (1 + \delta)s) + \epsilon_1. \tag{5.12}
\end{aligned}$$

From (5.1) we know that $LI_{n,m}^{red} \leq LI_n$ a.s., and so

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P} \left(\frac{LI_n - p_{max}n}{\sqrt{n}} \leq s \right) & \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{LI_{n,m}^{red} - p_{max}n}{\sqrt{n}} \leq s \right) \\
& \leq (1 + \epsilon_1) \mathbb{P}(R(p_{max}, k) \leq (1 + \delta)s) + \epsilon_1, \tag{5.13}
\end{aligned}$$

for large enough n . But since ϵ_1 and δ are arbitrary, (5.13) and (5.6) together show that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{LI_n - p_{max}n}{\sqrt{n}} \leq s\right) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(R(p_{max}, k) \leq s), \quad (5.14)$$

for all $s > 0$.

The proof for $s < 0$ is similar. Indeed, since necessarily $p_{max} < 1/k$, $R(p_{max}, k)$ describes the limiting distribution of the longest increasing subsequence for a non-uniform alphabet, and so is supported on $\mathbb{R}$. One then needs only examine quantities of the form, *e.g.*, $\mathbb{P}(R(p_{max}, k) \leq (1 - \delta)s)$, instead of $\mathbb{P}(R(p_{max}, k) \leq (1 + \delta)s)$, as we have done throughout the proof for $s > 0$. These changes lead to the resulting statement. ■

Remark 5.1 *As an alternative to the above proof, one could certainly adopt the finite-alphabet development of the previous sections so as to express LI_n , for countable infinite alphabets, in terms of approximations to functionals of Brownian motion. More precisely,*

$$\begin{aligned} LI_n &= \sup_{m \geq 2} \max_{\substack{0 \leq k_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq k_{m-1} \leq n}} \left\{ S_{k_1}^1 + S_{k_2}^2 + \dots + S_{k_{m-1}}^{m-1} + a_n^m \right\} \\ &= \sup_{m \geq 2} \left\{ \frac{n}{m} - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{r=1}^{m-1} r S_n^r + \max_{\substack{0 \leq k_1 \leq \dots \\ \leq k_{m-1} \leq n}} \sum_{r=1}^{m-1} S_{k_r}^r \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where a_n^m counts the number of occurrences of the letter α_m among $(X_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}$, and $S_k^r = \sum_{i=1}^k Z_i^r$ is the sum of independent random variables defined as in (2.3). After centering and normalizing the S_k^r , as was done to obtain (3.11) in the non-uniform finite alphabet development, one could then try to apply Donsker's Theorem to obtain a Brownian functional, which we now know to be distributed as $R(p_{max}, k)$.

6 Concluding Remarks

Our development of the general finite-alphabet case leads us to consider several new directions in which to pursue this method and raises a number of interesting questions. These include the following.

- Extending our fixed finite-alphabet case to that of having each X_n take values in $\{1, 2, \dots, m_n\}$ is an important first step. Fruitful approaches to such asymptotic questions would nicely close the circle of ideas initiated here. Such a study is already under consideration (see [14]).
- As we have noted throughout the paper, there is a pleasing if still rather mysterious connection between our limiting distribution results and those of random matrix theory. This connection deserves to be further explored. Recall, for instance, Baryshnikov's observation [4] that the process D_m is identical in law to the process $\lambda_1^{(m)}$ consisting of the largest eigenvalues of the $m \times m$ minor of an infinite GUE matrix. This fact is consistent with an interleaving-eigenvalue result from basic linear algebra, namely, that if $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n$ are the eigenvalues of an $n \times n$ symmetric matrix A , and if $\mu_1 \geq \mu_2 \geq \dots \geq \mu_{n-1}$ are the eigenvalues of the matrix consisting of the first $(n-1)$ rows and columns of A , then $\lambda_1 \geq \mu_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \mu_{n-1} \geq \lambda_n$. We thus see the consistency between the $D_m \leq D_{m+1}$ a.s. fact noted above and that of $\lambda_1 \geq \mu_1$.
- Pursuing our analysis further, one might hope to find ways in which we can derive the densities of our limiting functionals in a direct manner. Its, Tracy, and Widom [16] have obtained clear expressions of the limiting distributions. While we have obtained our limiting distributions in a rather direct way, in turn, these densities do not clearly follow from our approach. This point deserves more work.
- In another direction, our independent-letter paradigm can be extended to various types of dependent cases, foremost of which would be the Markov case. This will be presented elsewhere [15], where the framework of [13] is, moreover, further extended.
- Various other types of subsequence problems can be tackled by the methodologies used in the present paper. To name but a few, comparisons for unimodal sequences, alternating sequences, and sequences with blocks will deserve further similar studies.

Acknowledgements C.H. would like to thank Zhan Shi for discussions and encouragements on this project. Both authors would like to thank the organizers of the Special Program on High-Dimensional Inference and Random Matrices at SAMSI. Their hospitality and support, through the grant DMS-0112069, greatly facilitated the completion of this paper.

References

- [1] Aldous, D.; Diaconis, P.; Hammersley's Interacting Particle Process and Longest Increasing Subsequences. *Prob. Theory Related Fields*, vol. 103 (1995), 199-213.
- [2] Aldous, D.; Diaconis, P.; Longest Increasing Subsequences: From Patience Sorting to the Baik-Deift-Johansson Theorem. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, vol. 36 (1999), no. 4, 413-432.
- [3] Baik, J.; Deift, P.; Johansson, K.; On the Distribution of the Length of the Longest Increasing Subsequence of Random Permutations. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, vol. 12 (1999), no. 4, 1119-1178.
- [4] Baryshnikov, Y.; GUEs and Queues, *Prob. Theory Related Fields*, vol. 119 (2001), 256-274.
- [5] Cator, E.; Groeneboom, P.; Hammersley's Process with Sources and Sinks. *Ann. Prob.*, vol. 33 (2005), 879-903.
- [6] Cator, E.; Groeneboom, P.; Second Class Particles and Cube Root Asymptotics for Hammersley's Process. Preprint (2006).
- [7] Chistyakov, G.P.; Götze, F.; Distribution of the Shape of Markovian Random Words. *Prob. Theory Related Fields*, vol. 129 (2004), 18-36.
- [8] Glynn, P.W.; Whitt, W.; Departure from Many Queues in Series. *Ann. Appl. Prob.*, vol. 1 (1991), 546-472.
- [9] Gravner, J.; Tracy, C.; Widom, H.; Limit Theorems for Height Fluctuations in a Class of Discrete Space and Time Growth Models. *J. Stat. Phys.*, vol. 102 (2001), nos. 5-6, 1085-1132.
- [10] Groeneboom, P.; Hydrodynamical Methods for Analyzing Longest Increasing Subsequences. *J. Comp. and Appl. Math.*, vol. 142 (2002), 83-105.
- [11] Groeneboom, P.; Ulam's Problem and Hammersley's Process. *Ann. Appl. Prob.*, vol. 29 (2001), no.2 , 683-690.

- [12] Hambly, B.M., Martin, J.B., O’Connell, N.; Concentration Results for a Brownian Directed Percolation Problem. *Stoch. Proc. and their App.*, vol. 102 (2002), 207-220.
- [13] Houdré C; Lember, J.; Matzinger, H.; On the Longest Common Increasing Binary Subsequence. *C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I*, vol. 343 (2006), 589-594.
- [14] Houdré C; Litherland, T.; Longest Increasing Subsequence Asymptotics for Growing Alphabets. (In preparation).
- [15] Houdré C; Litherland, T.; On the Markovian Longest Common Increasing Subsequence Problem. (In preparation).
- [16] Its, A.R.; Tracy, C.; Widom, H.; Random Words, Toeplitz Determinants, and Integrable Systems. I. Random Matrix Models and their Applications, 245-258, *Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ.*, vol. 40, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2001.
- [17] Its, A.R.; Tracy, C.; Widom, H.; Random Words Random Words, Toeplitz Determinants, and Integrable Systems. II. Advances in Non-linear Mathematics and Science, *Phys. D*, 152-153 (2001), 199-224.
- [18] Johansson, K.; Discrete Orthogonal Polynomial Ensembles and the Plancherel Measure. *Ann. of Math.*, vol. 153 (2001), 199-224.
- [19] Kuperberg, G.; Random Words, Quantum Statistics, Central Limits, and Random Matrices. *Meth. Appl. Anal.*, vol. 9 (2002), no. 1, 99-118.
- [20] Logan, B.F.; Shepp, L.A.; A Variational Problem for Random Young Tableaux. *Advances in Math.*, vol. 26 (1977), 206-222.
- [21] Mehta, M.L.; *Random Matrices*, 3rd ed., Academic Press, 2004.
- [22] O’Connell, N., Yor, M.; Brownian Analogues of Burke’s Theorem. *Stoch. Proc. and their App.*, vol. 96 (2001), 285-304.
- [23] O’Connell, N., Yor, M.; A Representation for Non-Colliding Random Walks. *Elect. Comm. in Prob.*, vol. 7 (2002), 1-12.
- [24] Pitman, J.W.; One-Dimensional Brownian Motion and the Three-Dimensional Bessel Process. *Adv. Appl. Prob.*, vol. 7 (1975), 511-526.

- [25] Seppäläinen,T; A Microscopic Model for Burgers Equation and the Longest Increasing Subsequence. *Elec. J. Prob.*, vol. 1 no. 5 (1996), 1-51.
- [26] Seppäläinen,T; A Scaling Limit for Queues in Series. *Ann. Appl. Prob.*, vol. 7 (1997), 855-872.
- [27] Tracy, C.; Widom, H.; On the Distributions of the Lengths of the Longest Monotone Subsequences in Random Words. *Prob. Theory Related Fields*, vol. 119 (2001), 350-380.
- [28] Tracy, C.; Widom, H.; Level-spacing Distributions and the Airy Kernel. *Comm. Math. Phys*, vol. 159 (1994), 151-174.
- [29] Vershik, A; Kerov, S; Asymptotics of the Plancherel Measure of the Symmetric Group and the Limiting Form of Young Tables, *Soviet Math. Dokl.*, vol. 18 (1977), 527-531.

File reference: finalpha40.tex/pdf